VOBIS

OR

GHOSPELL AND LIBERTIE AGAINST ANCIENT AND MODERN PAPISTS.

BY

E. G.

PREACHER OF THE WORD.

DEDICATED TO THE RIGHT HON^ble THE LORD HALIFAX.

Stand fast in the Liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage (Popery) Gal. c. 5. v. 1.

Anno 1679.

110. k. 13.

BIBLIOTHECA · BODLEIANA

THE PREFACE TO THE CHILDREN OF THE REFORMATION.

BE not concern'd to know whose hand it is which holds the link, but follow the light it gives: reach your hand to receive this Treatise, which marks the shore, where the *Ark* of our Reformation, shatter'd by a deluge of troubles, may rest; which is a Holy liberty to all and each Person to believe or not believe; act or not act, as he pleases with a safe conscience acording the Principles of our Reformation. We generally lament the convulsions which shake our Church and State, through the diversity of opinions, professed by our several Congregations; som remedies have bin applied to bring vs to Peace and conformity; but all have proved ineffectual; som of our Drs judge, nothing can cure our disease, but a General Council or supream Authority, to whose sentence we should all submit; but this, besides that it is Popish, to grant any human Power for to oblige our consciences against

our jugdments in matters of Religion; is but an imaginary remedy for a real Evil: for, it's not in the Reformation as in Popery; in this there is a supream Authority for to convene the Pastors of diverse kingdoms to a general Council; in our Reformation there is none: Popery believes its Councils and Popes *infallible*; and therefore they cannot but acquiesce, because an infallible sentence leaves no doubt of the Truth; but in the Reformation, all Councils and human Authority are *fallible*; and consequently their Decisions may be doubted of, and we are never certain of the Truth.

Others judge, the remedy of our disease can be no other, but Pills of persecution, penal laws, Acts of Parliament, Ordinances of Synods, forcing men to conformity; but this has proved not only destructive to the peace of the Church, but has shockt the very foundation of our Reformation: for if we must believe under severe penalties what the State and Ecclesiastical Authority will have vs believe; then scripture must be no more our Rule of faith, but the state and Church, which tells me what I must believe; and we must be deprived of the right and power of interpreting

Scripture and believing it in the ſenſe we think it to be the true; and yet our whole Reformation is cemented and was firſt raiſed vpon this Holy Libertie; That every one ſhould reade Scripture, interpret it, and believe whatever he thought was the true ſenſe of it; without any compulſion or conſtraint for to believe either Church, State, Univerſitie or Dr. if wee did not judge by Scripture his Doctrin was true.

If Prudence had as great a ſhare in our Conduct, as Paſſion, wee ſhould regulat our future by the effects of our paſt actions; and if wee will caſt an eye back to the tranſactions of later years, we will find this compulſion of Mens Conſciences has produced but confuſion in our Church, and fatal diſturbances in our State; contrarywiſe, never did our Reformation enjoy more peace, ſhin'd with more luſtre, and held its courſe with more happineſs, than when none was moleſted for his Profeſſion, but euery one had libertie to believe and teach, what Doctrin and ſenſe each one thought to be the moſt conformable to Scripture. Conſider the infancy of the Reformation, when God raiſed Luther to repair the ruins of the Church; how of a ſuddain it ſpred it ſelf

in Germany, France, Holland, Poland, Scotland and England, and by what means? was it not by takeing away all constraint of mens Consciences (vsed then only in the Popish Church) our blessed Reformers takeing to themselves and giving to others, a Holy libertie for to teach and believe what ever they judged to be the Doctrin and true Sense of Scripture, tho it should be against the received opinion of the Councils, Chureh, Universities and Drs.? look into the Reign of Edward the VI. then, did our Reformation florish in England; and was miraculously propagated by the Liberty of Martin Bucer, Cranmer, Ochinus, Peter Martyr and others in teaching Calvinism, Lutheranism, Zuinglianism by Scripture as every one vnderstood it: Descend to the reing of Queen Marie; then, the light of the Ghospel was eclypsed, because the flock was again popishly compelled to believe, not what they judged by Scripture to be true; but what the Pope and Church judged was such: Com down a step lower to Queen Elizabeths time; then, the flock recouering that holy liberty for to believe what each one thought was the Doctrin of Scripture; the Reformation gained ground;

our ſeveral Congregations lived peaceably; for tho Proteſtancy was eſtabliſht the Religion of the Land; others were not oppreſſed, nor their liberty conſtrained by compulſions: ſtep down a degree lower to king James his time; the Reformation held its courſe as proſperouſly as in Queen Elizabeths time, becauſe mens conſciences were not oppreſſed; all Reformed Brethren had full libertie to believe as they pleaſed; tho Proteſtancy was the Religion of the King: look down a ſtep lower to king Charles the firſt's reign; his Matie carried with a godly zeale of reſtraining the diverſity of opinions, begot by the liberty enjoyed in his Predeceſſors times, would by new Laws and Ordinances force the flock to an Uniformity of Doctrin, but our zealous Brethren the Preſbyterians, impatient of any conſtraint in affairs of Religion, and pleading for the Evangelical Libetty of our Reformation, for to believe nothing, nor vſe any Rites or Ceremonies but as each one judged by Scripture to be convenient; they covenanted againſt his Majeſtie and Bishops; and the ſtorm grew to that height, that both Church and ſtate were drown'd almoſt in the blood of our Reformed

Brethren: laſtly looke vpon our Realm as it is at preſent, the ſymptoms of diſatisfactions which you may read and hear in the *Coffie* houſes, in publik and privat converſations; the ſparkles of jealouſies, which appear in our land; the Cabals againſt our gouernment; the animoſitie of deuided parties; the murmur and complaints of all; what's all this but the ſmoke of that hidden fire of zeale, wherwith Proteſtants would force Preſbytherians by penal Laws, to profeſs their Tenets, Presbyterians exclaim againſt Proteſtancy as againſt Popery; Quakers judge both to be limbs of Satan; Anabaptiſts looke on all three as Children of Perdition; and no Congregation would give libertie for to profeſs any Tenets but its owne; in ſo much that if you conſider all well, each of our Cõgregations, are as ſevere Tyrants ouer our judgments and conſciences, as Popery was; and our Reformation comes to be in effect but an exchange of one Italian Pope, for many English ones: for as in Popery, we muſt ſubmit our judgments to the Pope and Church of Rome, or be eſteemed putrid rotten members; and be ſhut out of heauens gates; and ſuffer Inquiſitions, perſecutions, excommunica-

tions and what not; ſo among vs, you muſt believe Scripture as interpreted by the Church of England, or you are condemned by them; you muſt believe Scripture as interpreted by the Presbyterians, or you are accurſed by them; you muſt believe as Anabaptiſts do, or you are damn'd by them; and not one Congregation among vs, but would root all the others out of the world, if it could; and wee do not feare that danger wherof S. Paul Gal. 5. 15. warns vs, *If wee bite and devour one an other, let's take heed, wee be not conſumed one of an other*; giving vs likewiſe a holſom advice in the ſame place, how to prevent this euil; *Stand faſt in the libertie, wherewith Chriſt has made vs free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage*: The world did groan vnder this heauy yoke in Popery; wherin our Rule of faith, was Scripture as interpreted by the Pope and Church: Scripture was kept from the hand of the flock: no man permitted to give or believe any interpretation or ſenſe of it, but what the Pope, Church and Fathers did approve: our reaſon, our judgments, our conſciences were ſlaves vnder this yoke, vntill that God raiſed

our glorious and bleſſed Reformers Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius, Beza and others who tooke a holy Libertie, and gave vall libertie for to reade and interpre Scripture: to believe no Doctrin, bu what wee judged to be true by Scripture to believeany ſenſe of it, which wee judged to be true, tho contrary to all th world: they tooke for their Rule of fait Scripture, and nothing elſe but Scriptur as each one of them vnderſtood it; th ſame Rule of faith they left to vs, and holy freedom and libertie of our judg ments and conſciences, that any man o ſound judgment may hold, and belie whatever ſenſe of it, he thinks to b true.

This therefore is the ſcope and end o my following Treatiſe; that, wheras ou Rule of faith, as I will prove by th vnanimous cõſent of our whole Reform ed Church, is Scripture or Gods Wri ten Word, as interpreted by each perſo of ſound judgment; that wheras by the Principles of our Reformation, n man is to be conſtrained to believe an Doctrin againſt his judgment and con ſcience: (otherwiſe why were not we left in Popery) it is impious, tyran

cal, and quite againſt the ſpirit of the Reformation, to force vs by Acts of Parliaments, Decrees of Synods, invectives, and perſecutions of indiſcreet Brethren, to embrace this or that Religion; that every one ought to be permitted to believe what he pleaſe; if you think Bigamy to be the Doctrin of Scripture: if you think by Scripture there is one Nature and four Perſons in God; if you think Tranſubſtantiation to be true; if you judge by Gods Word ther's neither Purgatory nor Hell; finally whatever you think to be the true ſenſe of ſcripture, you are bound as a true Reformed Child, to believe it; that it is quite againſt the ſpirit of the Reformation to cenſure, oppoſe or blame the Doctrin or Tenets of any Congregation, or of any Doctor of the Reformed Church; becauſe, that any Doctrin profeſſed by any Chriſtian Congregation whatever (the Popish excepted) or that ever was delivered by any man of good judgment of the Reformation, ſince the beginning of it, vntill this day, is as truly and really the Doctrin of the Reformation, as the Figurative Preſence or Kings ſupremacy is. Conſequently Proteſtants are

deſervedly to be checkt for perſecutin
Quakers; Quakers, for murmuring again
Preſbyterians; theſe, for their invectiv
againſt Anabaptiſts and Socinians; A
are very good; and you may lawfull
according the Principles of our Reform
tion believe them, or deny them.

This Evangelical libertie of believin
any thing, which we judge to be the ſen
of ſcripture, tho all the reſt of the wor
should judge it to be a blaſphemie,
the moſt diſtinctive ſign of the Refo
mation from Popery; for Papiſts are t
Children of Agar the ſlave; they li
in bondage and conſtraint to believe a
Doctrin, which the Pope and Church p
poſes to them; and if a learned man
vniverſity should judge it to be contra
to Scripture; he muſt ſubmit his jud
ment to that of the Pope, or be co
demn'd as an Heretic: in our Reform
tion, wee are the Children of *Sara* t
Free; our Rule of faith is Scripture
each Perſon of ſound judgment in t
Church vnderſtands it; if wee do n
like the Doctrin of the Pope, Church
Council, wee may gainſay them all, a
hold our own ſenſe of Scripture:
enjoy the Prerogative of Rational cr

tures, we are lead by our own reason, which God has given vs for our conduct, and are not like Beasts, constrained to follow that of others. Wee follow the Rule given vs by S. Paul Rom. 14. *He who eates, let him not despise him who does not eate; and he who does not eate, let him not despise him who does eate, for God hath received him*: that's to say, he who believes let him not check him who does not believe, as he does: and he who does not believe, let him not blame him who does believe: but let each one believe, or not believe as he thinks best in the Lord: This holy libertie and freedom is the Spirit of God, for, *where the Spirit of God is, there is libertie*, 2. Cor. 3. saies the great Apostle: The Lord inspire to our Parliament that now sits vpon a perfect and new settlement of Gouvernment and Religion, to follow the footsteps of our first renowned Reformers: to enact that there may be no other Rule of faith, but that which wereceived from our Reformers, and which is laid down for vs in the 39 Articles of the Church of England: that is, Scripture as each one best vnderstands it, without regarding the judgment, sense, or interpretation of any

but the pure *Word of God*, as we vnderſtand it: and to enact Penal Laws againſt any ſo bold and vncharitable, as to cenſure or blame the Tenets of any Congregation, be it Lutheraniſm, Preſbyterie, Arianiſm, Judaiſm or Paganiſm: or any Doctrin whatever, that any man of ſound judgment thinks in his conſcience to be the ſenſe and Doctrin of Scripture.

Three things make me hope, that this Treatiſe will be wellcom to the well inclined and pious Reader of our Reformed Church: firſt, that there is not one author quoted in this booke, but our own Doctors, learned and godly Children of the Reformation; and this I obſerve, that my Reader may know ther's not a Jot of any Doctrin heer but what is of the Reformation; and alſo advertiſe our Writers and Schoole men, how much, they diſcredit our Reformed Church, by makeing ſo much vſe of Popish Drs. and Bookes in their Writings; as if wee had not great and learned men of our own; if wee looke into our Bishops and Miniſters libraries; wee ſhall meet but books either of confeſſedly Papiſts, or ſtrongly ſuſpected of Popery; and you ſhall hardly meete

in any of them, the works of Luther, Calvin, Beza, or any of our own authors, if you do not meet som Comedies, or Romances: if you reade our Modern Writers, you shall find their bookes to be stuft with arguments stolen from Stapleton, Peron, Bellarmin, and other Popish Drs. wheras they ought to take their Doctrin from Luther, Calvin and our other first Reformers, Apostles raised by Gods heavenly Spirit; Oracles by whose mouths and pens he delivered the pure and Orthodox Doctrin of the Ghospel; heavenly Fontains, from which wee ought to drink the Doctrin of the Reformation: therefore, J have made a particular study, for the comfort of my Reader, not to profane this Treatise with any quotation of any Popish Writer, none but our own Drs.

Secondly my Reader will be pleased with this Treatise, becaus J do not oblige him to believe the contents of it: if he misliks any Doctrin couched in this booke, let him not believe it; if he likes it, let him believe it; what J pretend is, to maintain his libertie for to believe or not believe what he please and that none can say black in his eye,

for believing whatever he judges to be the ſenſe of Scripture; let all others think of it what they will; for, our Rule of faith, as J will prove, being Scripture as each Perſon vnderſtands it, who can be ſo bold as to check you for teaching and believing what you vnderſtand ſcripture to ſay? ſom Doctrins there are in this booke delivered by Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius, Beza, and others; which our Church of England and ſom others do call blaſphemies, and ſcandalous Tenets; and their irreverence and arrogance is run ſo farr: as to condemn thoſe bleſſed men, for teaching ſuch Tenets, and ſay that they ſwerved from the truth; and had their fraileties, in ſo much, that many of vs are aſhamed to own thoſe great men to have been our Reformers and leaders: this is an impiety altogither inſupportable, it cannot be ſuffered with patience, that ſuch Apoſtolical men, who were vndeniably our firſt Maſters of the Reformation, ſhould be ſo vilified and abuſed: therefore J do prove, that ther's no Doctrin delivered by them, but is to be eſteemed and called the Doctrin of the Reformation: and can be according the Principles of the Re-

formed Church, believed and taught by any Reformed Child: for what is our *Rule of faith* in the Reformation, but Scripture as each Person of sound judgment vndestands it? consequently what is the *Doctrin* of the Reformation, but what any Person of sound judgment vnderstands to be of Scripture: whatever Doctrin therefore, Luther, Calvin, or others judged to be of Scripture: how can you deny it to be the Doctrin of the Reformation: or blame them for teaching and believing it? if you do not like it: the most, you can in justice do, is not to believe it: but you cannot justly say its not the Doctrin of the Reformation, becaufe it's Scripture as vnderstood by Persons of good judgment: nor can you in justice blame them; or any other for believing it, if they like it: for, must not wee believe, what wee judge in our conscience to be the Doctrin of Scripture?

Lastly my Reader will be pleased with the fincerity and plain dealing of this Treatise: as much as wee are all offended by the dissimulation and double dealing of our Modern Writers, whose aim and scope in the bookes they give out

Seems to be nothing elſe, but to ſay ſo
what whereby they may be thought t
be no *Papiſts*, and nothing is leſs foun
in their Writings, than the pure and o
thodox Doctrin of the Reformation
and what is to be bemoan'd, that you
hardly ſee in the houſes or hands of th
flock the works of Luther, Calvin, o
our other firſt Reformers, they are hi
from vs, to keep vs in ignorance of th
true Reformed Doctrin, and wee ſee bu
Bramhal, Tillinſon, Taylor, Stillingfleet
Thorndix and ſuch others, whoſe Doc
trin is neither Popery, nor of the Refor
mation, but a new compound of both
they do ſo mangle the queſtions co
troverted with their ſcholaſtical ſubti
lities and diſtinctions, as if they we
ashamed to own openly our Tenet
and did endeauor to get the opinion o
moderat ſober men with the Papiſts b
drawing as neer as their Intereſt ca
permit them, to their Doctrin. As
them, if we be obliged to believe th
Doctrin and ſenſe of ſcripture delivere
by a general Council? our firſt Refor
mers reſolved roundly that we are not
nay Luther, ſaies expreſly we are boun
to gainſay, and work againſt the De

trees of any Council: but our Modern Doctors anſwer with a pretty Diſtinction, *Ther's a civil obligation*, quoth one, *but no obligation in conſcience: Ther's an obligation in conſcience*, ſaies an other, *provided you do not believe they are infallible: you may believe they are infallible objectively or terminatively*, ſaies an other: *but not ſubjectively: they are infallible in fundamental points*, ſaies an other, *but not in inferior Truths.* An other will come yet, and ſay they are abſoluty infallible in all Articles, and thus by little and little, the Papiſts gain ground againſt vs, and the luſtre of our Reformation is clouded by the cowardlineſs, or inſincerity, or hiprociſy of our Modern teachers. 1. Kings 18. *How long halt ye between two opinions? if the Lord be God, follow him: but if Baal, then follow him*: Luther, Calvin, Beza and our other firſt Reformers were raiſed by God to teach vs the purity of the Ghoſpel: let vs not be aſhamed to follow their Doctrin: to ſpeake, preach, and believe as they did: Therefore, I do propoſe their Doctrin in this Treatiſe in its native coulours, that if you like it, you may believe it, and if any be ſo

bold as to Say you believe fals or fc
dalous Doctrin, you must answer:
the Doctrin of the Reformation, b
cause its Scripture as vnderstood
Persons of judgment, and the greate
Oracles wee had: and if you do n
like it, you may deny it, but bewa
never to blame or check any other f
believing it: this is the Holy libertie
the Ghospel and of our Primitive R
formation.)

FIRST DIALOGUE.

ISMAEL. I have read your Preface and Principles, & me thinks you drive to establish a new Religion; for that vnlimited libertie, which you assert for to believe or not believe whatever we please with a safe Conscience, is not allowed by any of our Reformed Congregatiõs; and it were to be wisht you should rather stick to som one of the Congregations now establisht, than to erect a new one for we have but too many already.

Isaac. The Lord forbid. I should think or speake otherwise then as becometh a true child of the Reformation: If you will oblige me to believe Scripture as interpreted by the Lutheran Church (the like I say of any other Congregation) and deny the Tenets of all others, what difference

betwixt me and a Papiſt in the elec
of my Religion? for the Papiſt's R
ligion muſt be no other, but Script
as interpreted by thePope and Cōc
my Religion muſt be Scripture as int
preted by the Lutheran Church, a
no other; my judgment and Conſci
therefore is as much conſtrained as t
of the Papiſt; and our ſeparation fr
Popery will com to be but an exchan
of one ſlavery for another; in *th*
our judgments and Conſciences w
ſlaves to the Pope and Councils:
this, we are ſlaves to the Luthe
Church: We became a Reformat
by ſhaking of the yoke of Pop
from our judgments, and leaving th
free for to believe Scripture as w
the aſſiſtance of Gods ſpirit, each
beſt vnderſtands it; and if we w
continue a Reformation, we muſt
ſubmit again our judgments to a
other, but retain that bleſſed liber
we recouered for to believe the Ten
of any Congregation. I confeſſ thi
bertie is not allowed by any one p
ticular Congregation, as you obſer
but you muſt alſo grant me, that
allowed & taken by the whole bod
of the Reformation, for in this wh

body, as it comprehends Proteſtants, Lutherans, Preſbyterians, &c. one Congregation believes what the other denies, and in any of them a man may live with a ſafe Conſcience (which you will not denie;) therefore any man has full libertie for to believe or deny with a ſafe Conſcience the Tenets of any Congregation: hence it follows (and to my grief I ſpeake it) that no particular Congregation, be it of England, France, or Germanie, has the true ſpirit of the Reformation, in doting ſo much vpon their particular Tenets, as to thinke they cannot be as well denied, as believed; and in looking vpon them with ſo paſſionat eyes, as to cenſure, check and force others to believe them: you ſhall ſee by this diſcourſe, that the true ſpirit of the Reformation is not in any one particular Congregation ſeparatly taken from the reſt; for each particular Congregation conſtrains as much as it can, all people to believe its own Tenets: Proteſtancy would have vs all to be Proteſtants, and would root Lutherans out of the world as well as Popery; Lutherans would, if they could, draw all to their

own Nett; Presbytery esteems itself to be the best of all, & would crush Protestancy if it could: This then is the spirit of each particular Congregation, a *Limiting*, *confining* spirit to som particular Tenets with an exclusion of all others; but looke on the whole Body of our Reformation, as it includes all Reformed Congregations distinct from Popery; there is a holy extension of spirit and liberty for to be either Lutherans, Presbyteriants, Protestans, and any thing but Popery, and whatever any Congregation may say of an other, but all vnanimously agree that the spirit of the Lord is in the whole body of the Reformation, since therefore that in this whole Body there is alatitude & liberty for to profess divers and opposit Tenets, and that each Tenet is believed by one, and denied by others; we must grant that this holy liberty for to believe or deny any Tenets we please, is the true spirit of our holy reformation.

It's not therefore to be wisht, as you do, that I should stick to any one particular Congregation or Tenets;

for ſuch a reſtriction is meer Popery; and your bemoaning the multiplicity of our Congregations is profane and Popiſh: No, its a bleſſing of the Lord vpon our Reformation, for which we ſhall never ſufficiently thanx him, that we ſee it divided into ſo many Godly branches. *In the houſe of my father,* ſaid Chriſt, *there are many manſions* Joan. 14. 2.

Iſmael. By your diſcourſe you ſeem to allow that we may with a ſafe conſcience change Religions as often as we pleaſe, and be to day a Proteſtant, to morrow a Lutheran, next day a Presbyterian, and ſo run ouer all.

Iſaac. I know you will be ſtartl'd at my anſwer, for I am not ignorant that all men apprehend it to be abſurd to change & run ouer ſo many religions; but truth muſt be declared though it may ſeem a *ſcandal to the Iews*, and *a folly to the Gentils*: Its therefore the Doctrin of the Reformation that we may with a ſafe conſtience be to day Proteſtants, to morrow Lutherans & in France Hugonots, in Hungarie Antitrinitarians, in Poland Socinians, ad in London of any Religion but Popery.

Ismael. For shame you fouly impo
vpon the Reformation; ther's not an
Congregation that teachs such a scan
dalous and absurd Doctrin.

Isaac. By your favor, I loue th
Reformation as the apple of my eye
and will never yield to any in my zeal
for its honor and doctrin; Jam so fa
from imposing upon it, that I will evi
dence your error in denying this to b
its Doctrin, and it will appear tha
whoever will deny it to be very lawfu
to change Religions as time and occa
sion requires, must renounce the bes
and fundamental Principles of our Re
formation, & must impiously condem
the practise of our first Reformers.

Ismael. How will you make it ou
that this Doctrin is grounded vpo
the fundamental Principles of our Re
formation; wheras there is not on
Congregation of ours, but abhorrs it!

Isaac Sr. You may well perceiv
by the tenor of my discours that Jam
piously and charitably iealous with
each particular Congregation, & that
my drift is to shew that each of them,
none excepted, swerves from and
transgresses against the true spirit, and

ſolid Principles of the Reformation; as will further appear in this diſcours.

Its vncontеſtedly true that the Rule of faith of the Reformation, is Scripture as the humble of heart aſſiſted with the ſpirit of the Lord vnderſtands it; for Lutherans will never admit their Rule of faith to be Scripture as interpreted by the Church of England, but as interpreted by themſelves; nor will England admit Scripture to be their Rule of faith as it is interpreted by the Presbyterians; but as interpreted by the Church of England: ſo that the Doctrin of each Congregation is but Scripture, as interpreted by them, and wheras all theſe Congregations joyntly compoſe the whole Body of the Reformation, and each Congregation is truly a member of the Reformation; the Doctrin of the Reformation coms to be Scripture, as each Congregation, and perſon of ſound judgment in the Reformation (ſaies the Church of England in her 39. Artic.) interprets it. This being an vncõtrouled truth; what man of euer ſo ſound a judgment, but may read to day Scripture, as interpreted by the Lutheran

Church, and judge in his conſcience that interpretation and Doctrin to be true: conſequently he may with a ſafe conſcience profeſs that Religion; ſoon after he may meet Calvins booxes, & charm'd with the admirable ſtrength of his reaſons and gloſſes vpon Scripture, he may judge in his conſcience he is to be preferr'd beforre Luther, and ſo may lawfully forſake Lutheraniſm for Calviniſm; then again he hits vpon Scripture as interpreted by the Church of England, whoſe Doctrin raviſh's him with that decencie of Ceremonies, that majeſty of her liturgie, that harmonie of her Hierarchie; he is convinc't its better than Calviniſm, & embraces it: Then again he reads the woxes of Arius, and convinc't by the energie of his argument and texts of Scripture produced by him, may alter his judgment and become an Arian. Wherin can you ſay does this man tranſgreſs againſt the Doctrin or principles of the Reformation? Does he forſaxe the Reformation becauſe he forſaxes Lutheraniſm for Calviniſm? No ſure; for Calviniſm is as much of the Reformation as the

other: Is not Proteſtancy as much the Doctrin of the Reformation as Preſbyterie? tho he changes therefore one for the other, he ſtill holds the Doctrin of the Reformation: Is not the Doctrin of the Reformation Scripture, not as Proteſtants onely, or Presbyterians onely interpret it, but as any Congregation or man of ſound judgment holds it? It is therefore evident that according the Doctrin and principles of the Reformation, he may with a ſafe conſcience change Religions, and be to day of one, to morrow of an other vntill he runs all ouer. Point me out any Congregation (the obſtinat Papiſts excepted) who will dare ſay, I cannot live with a ſafe conſcience in any other Congregation but in it ſelf; all other Congregations will laugh at it; Why then may not I lawfully forſake any Congregation, and paſs to an other? And be in England a Proteſtant, in Germany a Lutheran, in Hungarie an Antitrinitarian or Socinian.

Iſmael. It's againſt the grain of mans reaſon to believe that we can with a ſafe conſcience change Religions, as you ſay: If you be a Proteſtant, and

you judge it to be the true Religion
you are bound to ſtick to it, & neve
to change it.

Iſaac. If I did diſcourſe with a Papiſt
I would not wonder he ſhould ſay i
againſt the grain of mans reaſon t
believe it lawfull; but I admire tha
a Child of the Reformation, be he
what Congregation he will, ſhould b
ſo ignorant of his principles, as to ſa
a man cannot change Religions whe
he pleaſe: nor do I vndertake to prov
againſt the Papiſt, that this is lawfu
but I vndertake to prove it lawfu
againſt any Reformed Child, or for
him to deny the principles of the R
formation. Is it againſt reaſon th
a man may read to day Scripture,
the Lutherans interpretation vpon i
& like it very well; & that he ſhoul
in this caſe embrace that Religion
Is it againſt the graine of mans reaſo
that this ſame man ſhould next yea
afterwards hit vpon Calvins wor
vpon Scripture, and after better con
ſideration, think his Doctrin to ſu
paſs that of Luther, & could not h
then (being obliged to chooſe the beſt)
forſake Lutheraniſm and ſtick to Cal

viniſm? And is it againſt mans reaſon that he in following years may meet other bookes of Arians, Socinians, &c. & do the like? Have not we many examples of his in our beſt & moſt renowned Reformers? Did not Ochinus *that great light* (ſays B. Bale) *in whoſe preſence England was happie*, reading Scripture judge the Reformation to be better then Popery, & of a Capuchin fryar became à Reformed; after ſom years reading Scripture he judged Judaiſm to be better than the Reformation & became a Jew: Did not Martin Bucer one of our firſt Reformers of England & compoſers of our lyturgie, reading Scripture, judge Lutheraniſm to be better than Popery, & of a Dominicā fryar became a Lutheran? ſoon after reading Scripture, he judged Zuinglianiſm to be better than Lutheraniſm, & became a Zuinglian; not long after he became a Lutheran again as he confeſſes, [a] & forſooke Lutheraniſm the ſecond time, and returned again to Zuinglianiſm as *Sklusſer* ſays. [b] Did not Cranmer one of our firſt Reformers alſo of England, & compoſers of the 39. Articles, a wiſe

[a] Epiſt. ad Noremb. & in Commen. in Io. 6. & 16. Matt.

[b] Theol. Calvin. l. 2. fol. 70.

and Religious man profeſs Popery
Henry the VIII. time and compoſe
book in defence of *Real preſence*; the
in Edward the VI. time vpon bett
conſideration he profeſſed Zuingli
niſm and writ a book againſt *Real pr*
ſence; then again in Queen Mary
raign, being ſentenc'd to death, he d
clared for Popery; but ſeeing his reca
tation could not preſerve his life,
renounced Popery and dyed a Zuin
glian. I would tyre your patience
reading & myne in relating the num
ber of our prime, and moſt renowne
as well firſt Reformers, as Learne
Doctors, who without any ſcruple chā
ed ſeverall times their Religions; n
in te Principles of our Reformatio
ought they to be blamed: for wher
our Rule of faith is Scripture as wit
the aſſiſtance of Gods ſpirit we vnde
ſtand it, who doubts but we may t
day judge ſincerely Luther's ſenſe of
to be true, to morrow we may rea
with more attention & judge Ari
his ſenſe to be true; next day that
Calvin, & ſo of the reſt: And do no
think but that we have in England
many Abettors of this Doctrin: ala

how

how many Bishops, Deans and rich Parsõs do we know & haue we known, who were Zealous Presbyterians and declared enemies of Protestancie in our Gratious Soueraign's exile, and no sooner was he restored, & had Bishopricks and Ecclesiastical dignities to be giuen. but they became stiff Protestants.

Obserue the diffesence Betwixt the Papists and vs, if of a Papist you becom of any other Congregation, the Popish Church excommunicats you; thou art Lookt vpon as an *Heretic*, & *Apostat*, a *strayd sheep*; they will not admit you to their communion or lyturgy; nay could they well auoid you, they would neuer admit you to their Companie; and why? Becausse they are fondly perswaded their own is the only true Religion, and all others to be synagogues of Satan; and if any of vs will become a Papist, he must first abiure his former Profession: but if of a Protestant you should become a Presbyterian, a Lutheran, Quaker or of any other of our Societies, you are neuer Looked vpon to be a jot the worse for it; we are not a

Whit ſcandalized at ſuch change
which we daily ſee; and it is an
ſpeakable bleſſing with what acco
vnity and charitie, you may
at our lyturgie & communion the P
teſtant, Preſbyterian, Anabapti
Socinian and Hugonot, all prayſ
the Lord in one Congregation in
Churches, none bid out of the Chur
none excommunicated, no previ
abjuration required of their form
Tenets, & ther's nothing more f
quent among vs then to go to
Proteſtant Lyturgy in the mornin
in the euening to the Preſbyteri
eſpecially if our intereſt or con
niecie requires it: Can there be a m
convincing proofe that we eſte
it all alike what Religion & Ten
we profeſs? let a Lutheran go
France; alas! hee'l neuer ſtick to
to the Hugonots meeting and ſeruic
let a Proteſtant go to Germany, he
go as cheerfully to the Luther
Church, as in England to the P
teſtant: let a Hugonot or Preſbyteri
go to Hungary or Poland he is w
com to the Antitrinitarians, & Soc
nians; and when any of them retur

home hee'l be as before.

Ismael. But can you prove this Doctrin by the testimony of any of our synods? Did any teach that we may with a safe conscience change our Religion as you say?

Isaac. Yes I can: the Synod of Charenton in France held about the yeare 1634. expressly saies that for your salvation its all alike whether you be a Calviniſt, Lutheran or of any other Congregation of the Reformed, becauſe says this Venerable synod, *they all agree in fundamental points, and the Lutherans haue nothing of superstition or Idolatrie in their manner of divin worship.* Change then as often as you liſt; be a Lutheran, be a Presbyterian, be an Anabaptiſt, by the mouth of this synod you are assured you'l never miſſ to hit right. And I pray can any synod of our times haue more authoritie in point of Doctrin than Luther our first Reformer, a man extraordinarily raiſed by God (says the synod of Charenton) and repleniſht with his spirit for to repaire the ruins of his Church? He teachs *c the elevation of the sacra-*

c in pri-va Con-

ser. serm. fol. 55. & in Colloq. fol. 110.

ment is Idolatrie, yet he did practise and commanded it should be practised in the Church of Wittemberg to spite [illegible] *Deuil Carolstadius*: Giuing you to vnderstand that for just reasons, you may teach now one Religion, now an other. Zuinglius also whose virtue and Learning is knowen to the world

a To. 2. fol. 201.

says [a] *that God inspired him to preach what Doctrin was suitable to the time*: which as it often changes, you may often change your Doctrin: and consider you if it be not therefore that Christ our lord saies his *yoke is sweet & his burden light* (that is Religion) becauſe we can withdraw our Neck from it, as time and just reason requires.

Ismael. Could you giue me any Synod of the Church of England which deliuers this Doctrin, you would giue neere hand to convince me; for, that some particular Doctors should have taught or practis'd it, does not prove it to be the Doctrin of the Reformation.

Isaac. And what greater authority has a synod of England for to prove a Doctrin to be of the Reformation

than a ſynod of France which I have produced? Or than Luther and Zuinglius our firſt Reformers inſpired by God to teach vs the puritie of the Ghoſpel? Was it not from Luther and Zuinglius that England receiued the Doctrin of the Reformation? and if England be ſo bold as to ſay they erred in this, what aſſurance can we haue, but that they erred in the reſt? But ſince nothing will pleaſe you but a ſynod of England, you ſhall haue not one, but many. Can there be any ſynod in England of ſo great authoritie as our wiſe and prudent Parliaments? Read our Chronicles and you'l find, that in few years time, they changed and eſtabliſhed different Religions by publick acts of Parliament: In Henry the 8. Reigne they voted for Popery, and made Acts and Statuts againſt the Reformation; In Edward the 6. time they baniſht Popery and voted for Zuinglianiſm; In Queen Mary's they pull'd down this, and ſett vp Popery again; In Queen Elizabeths, they decryed this, and ſet vp not Zuinglianiſm, but Proteſtancy; in the midſt of her reign, they poliſht this, and

added ſom new perfections to it ; In King James and ſucceeding kings times, Proteſtancy is of a different ſtamp from that of Queen Elizabeths Heare *Doue* in his *Exhort : to the Engliſh Recuſants* an. 1603. pag. 31. *Henry the 8 had his Lyturgie which was very good : Edward the 6. condemned it, and brought in an other compoſed by Peter Martir and Bucer : in Elizabeths time, that was condemned, and an other approued, and in the middle of her reign, her Lyturgy was alſo miſliked, and a new one introduced, we are ſo wanton that nothing will cõtent vs but nouelties.*

Iſmael. Doue does not commend this Doctrin, for he calls that frequent exchange of Religion *Wantonneſſ* and loue of *noueltie*.

Iſaac. Its no great matter what he ſays of it ; my drift is but to convince you that this is the Doctrin, & practiſe of the beſt Members of our Reformation ; euen of England, and if you be convinc't its the Doctrin of the Reformation ; you cannot deny but that it is good Doctrin : if *Doue* calls it *wantonneſs*, S. Paul Epheſ. 4. 22. Coloſſ. 3. 9. & Rom. 6. 6. commends

it, and exhorts vs to put of the old man with its deeds (that's Popery with its ceremonies) and put on the new man (that's the Reformation) where ther's neither *Greek* nor *Iew*, *Circumcision*, nor *Incircumcision*, *Barbarian*, or *Scythian*, *bound* or *free*, but *Christ is all and in all*: that's to say; where ther's no distinction of Protestants or Presbyterians, Socinians, or Arians; its all one which Religion you profess.

Ismael. But is there no Tenet of Religion which we are all indispensably obliged to hold?

Isaac. Yes there is, and no more but one: *we are bound to have faith in Iesus Christ, son of God and Saviour of the world.* This is the substance of Christian Religion; be an Arian, be a Presbyterian, be a Socinian or what you please, be also plung'd to your ears in wickedness of life, and manners, so you have faith in Jesus Christ son of God and Redeemer of the world and live in charitie you will be a member of the true Church and be saved. Do not imagin this is any new Doctrin invented by me; search the vulgar sort

of our Reformed Brethren, you ſhall get thouſands of this opinion in our Realm; ſearch the Books of our Learned Drs, you ſhall find it in them alſo. Dr Morton in his much applauded booke dedicated to Queen Elizabeth, for which he deſerved a Biſhoprick, ſays: *The Arian Church is to be eſteemed a true Church, becauſe they hold the true ſubſtance of Chriſtian Religiõ, which is faith in Ieſus Chriſt ſon of God, and Redeemer of the world:* and again in the ſame place ſect. 4. whoſe Title, is, *Heretics are members of the Church*, he ſays, *whoſoeuer believes in Ieſus Chriſt tho by wickedneſſ of life, or Hereſy in Doctrin they ſhould err in Doctrin, they are ſtill true Members of the Church.* Therefore our learnd Fox, & Doctor Field, and Illiricus ſay the Greek Church notwithſtanding their error in denying *the Proceſſion* of the H. Ghoſt from the ſon, are holy members of the true Church, becauſe they have faith in Jeſus Chriſt.

e The Kingdom of Iſr. pag 9.

f Acts & mon. pag. 36. lib. 3. c. 5.

g Catal. teſtium pag. 976. & 978.

Iſmael. Sure you will not ſay this Doctrin is of the Reformation, or can be ſafely believed.

Iſaac. I do admire how you can doubt

of it, and that it may be believed: for what is the Doctrin of the Reformation but as we have said in our Principles, Scripture as interpreted by any man of sound judgement in the Church? and were not Doctor Morton, Fox, Field and Illiricus men of sound judgement, eminent Learning, and Godlines? if therefore this be Scripture as interpreted by them how can you deny it to be the Doctrin of the Reformation?

Ismael. And what Jesus Christ are we obliged to believe in? for Jesus Christ as believed by the Arians Socinians, Luther and, Calvin, is far different from Jesus Christ, as commonly believed by the Protestans and Popish Church, we believe in Jesus Christ the son of God, of one and the same substance and nature with the Father; they believe in a Jesus Christ, son of God but of a distinct and different nature and substance from the Father.

Isaac. Pish! that's but a nicetie; believe what you please, and what you vndestand by Scripture to be true and have charitie.

Ismael. I confess you have puzzled,

but yet not wholy convinced me; were I but perſwaded that what you have diſcourſed is truly the Doctrin of the reformation, J would cheerfully embrace it, and J will be better informed by your ſelf; but not tyre your patience: we will meet again and purſue our Diſcours vpon this ſubject.

II. DIALOGUE.

ISMAEL. Reflecting in my ſolitude vpon your laſt diſcours, J find it bottom'd vpon a fals principle; for you ſuppoſe that what euer Doctrin is of Luther Calvin, or any of our Learned, Drs, Synods, Parliaments, or Congregations, is the Doctrin of the Reformation and may without any more proof or ſcruple be believed by any Reformed Child; who but ſees this is ridiculous, to faſten the Doctrin and abſurd opinions of each particular Dr, or Congregation vpon the whole body: this is the vnchari-

table and vnreasonable art of the Papists, who keep a great coyl with som exorbitāt opinions of Luther and Calvin, and would perswade their Proselyts, they are the Tenets of the Reformation; wheras the Reformation disclaims those opinions as much as the Pope does: and they do not, poore people, observe how many absurd and scandalous Doctrins we meet in their *Casuists* and *Divins*, which when we reproach them with, they answer *its not the Doctrin of their Church, but of som particular* D^{rs}; as if we might not with as much justice as they, answer the same.

Isaac. Your reflection is good, and my discours will fall to ground if I do not prove that principle, which will be no hard task: Let vs imagin we are heere a full synod of Protestants, Presbyterians, Hugonots, Lutherans, Antitrinitarians, Anabaptists, Quakers, and of all and each of our Congregations; our Reformation is not any of theſe Congregations with an exclusion of the rest; but all of them ioyntly; for whatsoeuer Congregation would say it self alone is the Re-

formation, and no other, would be hiſs'd at by the reſt; and iuſtly; becauſe that our Reformation imports two points eſſentially: firſt a Profeſſion of Chriſtianitie according the Rule of the Word of God, and a deteſtation or abjuration of Popiſh Errors; and none of theſe Congregations but does both.

Iſmael. I know ſom of theſe, *Phariſee like.* deſpiſe others, and Looke upon them, not as Reformed, but as putrid members; but the Lord forbid I ſhould be ſo deuoid of charitie; I ſee no juſt challenge any can have to the Title of Reformation, which all haue not.

Iſaac. Let vs aſk this ſynod by what Rule of faith does the Reformation walk? what muſt a man believe for to be a *true Reformed*? Proteſtants will ſay, that Scripture and Apoſtolical Tradition; but Proteſtants ſay of Papiſts; and Preſbyterians and Anabaptiſts ſay of Proteſtants; that many human inventions are obtruded upon vs as Apoſtolical Traditions; that we have no way to diſcern the one from the other, and conſequently Tra-

dition,

dition, as being an vnknown thing vnto vs, cannot be our Rule: others will say that Scripture and the indubitable consequences out of it, is our Rule, all will grant this: but then enters the Controversie, if the consequences of Lutherans be such, and if the consequences of Presbyterians be indubitable out of Scripture, and each Congregation will say that their peculiar Tenets are indubitable consequences out of Scripture, and the rest must allow it to be true, or deny such a Congregation to be of the Reformation: Others will say that Scripture and the four first General Councils, with the Apostles and Athanasius's Creeds are our Rule of faith; but most of the assembly will no more admit the four first, than the subsequent Councils, nor Athanasius his Creed more than that of Trent; nor will the Quakers, Socinians and others value the Apostles Creed.

But there is none of all the Assembly, who will not admit Scripture thats the pure written word of God, to be a sacred and full Rule of faith, becauſe its replenisht with Divin

light and all Heavenly instruction necessarie for our saluation : and such as ad, as a part of our Rule of faith, the Apostles or Athanasius his Creeds, or the four first General Councils, they will confess that all they containe is expressed in Gods written word, and are but a plainer, or more distinct expression or declaration of the Contents of Scripture.

Ismael. Truly I must grant you this, that I have been often present at severall discourses of Protestants with Papists, and never yet could I heare a Protestant make Councils, Tradition, or any thing els the Text of their discours but onely scripture; not but that I could heare them say and pretend in their discourses that Apostolical Tradition, and the four first Councils were for them against Popery; but still their main strength and vltimat refuge was Scripture; for when ever they harp vpon that string of Tradition and Councils, the Papists are visibly too hard for them, and then they run to Scripture, than which there is no

plus vltra. I have been alſo often at ſeverall diſcourſes betwixt Proteſtans, Presbyterians and our brethren of other Congregations, and have obſerved that the Proteſtant, for to defend his lyturgie, Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of England, and her Epiſcopacy againſt the others, could never defend himſelf by ſcripture alone, and placed his main ſtrength againſt them in Tradition, Primitive Coüncils, and ancient Fathers, all which the others rejected and reproached the Proteſtant with Popery, for making vſe of that weapon; that if thy would ſtick to thoſe Principles as their Rule of faith, they muſt admit many Tenets of Popery, which they diſavow; that nothing but ſcripture is a ſufficient warrant and Rule of faith: And I find by all I could ever well vnderſtand, that its the General apprehenſion and belief of all the Reformation, that Scripture abundantly contains all we are obliged to believe, and is our ſole and adequat Rule of faith, and that our recours to Tradition, Councils, Fathers &c.

are but shifts of some of our Drs. who being *Non pluſt* in their particular engagements, and Sophiſtries, patch the incoherencie of their diſcours with theſe raggs of Popery.

Iſaac: I commend your ingenuity, but not that heate which tranſports you to check our Drs for their gloſſes and particular Doctrins vpon Scripture, which, as the *Manna* relisht of all sorts of Victuals which the Eater fancied, admits several senſes according the different ſpirits and meaſure of light that God gives to the Reader, and it is vndoubtedly the the Spirit of the Reformation to follow what ſenſe of it he likes beſt, and not to check others for following this or that as they pleaſe: Lutherans, Proteſtants, Presbyterians, &c. have all for their Rule of faith Scripture, which each of them interprets in a different ſenſe; Luther for the *Real*, Proteſtants for the *Figurative Preſence*; Proteſtants for Epiſcopacy; Presbyterians againſt it; and ſo of others: and tho each eſteems his own ſenſe to be the beſt, yet none, is ſo bold as to ſay the others may

not be saved in their own sense of it, or deny them to be true Children of the Reformation; nay that Venerable Synod of Charenton, as I quoted aboue, has declared that the Lutherans, tho opposit to them in their chief Tenets, are their beloved Brethren, and have nothing Idolatrous or superstitious in their manner of Divin worship: the fundamental reason of all this is, that our Rule of faith, is but Scripture as each Person of sound judgment vnderstands it.

Ismael. I grant all your discourse as to this particular; for its certain Lutherans will not admit Scripture as interpreted by Protestants, but as interpreted by themselves; and so of each other Congregation.

Isaac. If you admit *our Rule* is Scripture as each vnderstands it; then you must grant that *our Doctrin* of the Reformation is whateuer Doctrin each Person of sound judgment vnderstands to be of Scripture; and from this, it appears plainly that my Principle wherat you bogl'd is true; That; whateuer Doctrin is professed by any of our Congregations, Synods

Parliaments, Drs. or particular Dr. of our Reformation, is to be truly reputed and esteemed the Doctrin of the Reformation; which Principle being true; my discourse of yesterday is vndeniable, that you may change religions, as often as you please, and remain still a true Reformed Child.

Ismael. But you haue said that not only the Doctrin of each Congregation and Synod, is the Doctrin of the Reformation; but also whatever any one particular Doctor teachs; and this seems to be very absurd.

Isaac. It's not so absurd, as it is true; I'l prove by the Principles of our Reformed Church, by the testimonies of our most Learned and Best Drs. and Reformers, and by reason and experience that the Doctrin of any particular Doctor among vs, has as much right to be called and esteemed the Doctrin of the Reformation, as Protestancy, Presbytery or Lutheranism; for, what is Lutheranism, but the judgment of Luther a particular Dr, against the whole Church of Rome? what is Calvinism, but what Calvin a particular Dr, judged

to be the ſenſe of Scripture againſt that ſame Church? what is Quakery, but honeſt *Naylor's* godly and pious ſentiments vpon Scripture. Its vndeniably the Principle of our Reformed Church, that our Rule of faith is Scripture as interpreted, not only by Synods or Congregations, but by any Perſon of ſound judgment in the Church. No Congregation or Synod is to vs a Rule of faith: becauſe all are fallible; but Gods Written Word, as each one vnderſtands it; and if wee do not like the ſenſe of it delivered by any Council Synod or Congregation, wee may ſafely deny it: therefore our great Calvin [a] ſaies and proues with great energy of Scripture and reaſon, that *we are not obliged to the Deciſions and Doctrin of any Council Synod or Congregation, if after having examined Scripture, we do not find their interpretation and ſenſe of it, is conformable to the Word of God.* Let Synods and Congregations ſay what they will, if any particular Doctor thinks his own privat ſenſe of it to be better, he may ſtick to it againſt them all, and be a good

[a] l. 4. inſtit. c. 9

true Child of the Reformation? as *Arminius* in Holland did withstand the Synods of *Dordreet* and *Delphi*; as Luther and Calvin did against Rome. *I will be free*, saies our vnparalleld *Proto-Apostle* Luther, [b] *I will not submit my self to the authority of Councils, Church, Drs Vniuersities of Fathers, but will teach and preach whateuer I think to be true.* Did ever any Apostle speake with more courage? and the blessed man acted with no less; he knew full well the whole Stream of antiquity, Drs, Fathers and Councils were against him, as he confesses himself, and dit not care a rush for them all: *Lay aside*, saies he, [c] *arms of Orthodox antiquity, of Schools of Diuinity, authority of Fathers, Councils, Popes, and consent of ages, we receiue nothing but Scripture; but that we must haue the authority of interpreting it.*

[b] To. 1. Edit. Ien. in Resolut.

[c] lib. de serv. Arbit. cont. Erasm. edit. 1.

Nor was it only Luther and Calvin spoke thus, but all our first blessed Reformers; and why? because our Rule of faith is Scripture, not as interpreted by the Church of England, (France will not admit it)

nor as interpreted by the Quakers; (the Anabaptists and Independents will not heare it) nor as interpreted by Luther, (Calvin rejects it) nor as interpreted by Calvin (Thorndic and Bramhal will not yield to it,) nor will Stillingfleet stand to their interpretation; nor others to that of Stillingfleet. Finally our Rule of faith is Scripture, not as interpreted by any, but as each Congregation Synod, particular Dr, or man of sound judgment interprets it; and consequently what ever Doctrin any man of sound judgment judges to be of Scripture, is to be esteemed the Doctrin of the Reformation; and you may safely believe it, if you like it, and remain still as truely a Reformed Child, as the proudest Protestant of England.

Ismael. Can you prove that our Rule of faith is Scripture as any particular Dr or person of sound judgment vnderstands it?

Isaac. Behold how convincingly; first wee have heard Luther, quoted but now, say, We receive nothing but Scripture, but so as that

we must have the authority for t
interpret it: hear him again; [d] Th
Governors and Pastors haver powe
teach; but the sheep must give the
judgment whether they propose the voy
of Christ, or of strangers. And again:
Christ has taken from the Bishops Cou
cils and Pastors the right of judging of D
trin; and given it to all Christians
General; and the Rule is Scripture
each one will think fit to interpret
And consequently to this, wee ha
heard him say aboue, I will be fr
and will not submit to Drs Councils,
Pastors; but will teach whatever
think to be true. Barlow; [f] The Ap
stles have given to each particular t
Right and power of interpreting a
judging by his inward spirit, what
True; its needless that either man
Angel, Pope or Council should instru
you; the spirit working in the heart, an
Scripture are to each particular person mo
assured interpreters. Bilson Bishop o
Winceſter saies the same, [g] The peopl
must be discerners and judges of wha
is taught. Our Religion has no oth
Rule of faith (saies our French Re
formation by the mouth of Dumou

[d] In Colloq. Mensal. fol. 118.

[e] To. 2. Wittem. fol. 374. & 375.

[f] In Defens. Art. Reliq. Protest. pag. 199.

[g] In his true Differ. par 2. pag 353.

lin, [h] Drelincourt, and the holy Synod of Charenton) *but the Written Word of God, as interpreted by vs.* Lastly saies the Church of England in the 6th. Art. of their 39. *We have no other Rule of faith but Scripture as each person of sound judgment in the Church vnderstãds it, and what is proved by it*: and again in the *Catholic Doctrin* of the Church of England pag. 103. which is but an expositon of the 39. Articles. *Our Rule of faith is but Scripture as each Person of sound judgment in the Church vnderstands it: Authority is given to the Church and to each person of sound judgment in it, to judge in Controversies of faith; and this is not the privat judgment of our Church, but also of our Brethren of forreign Countries*

[h] Boulier de la Foy.

Ismael. J confess, not only these, but many other Drs abet your discourse, and the General Vogue of our Reformation, is for Scripture as each one vnderstands it; but alas! you see well, that wee can never settle any Religion or Church by such a Rule of faith.

Isaac. You can never settle any but

rhis, *That every man may without le*
or hinderance believe what he pleaſe
and why ſhould not this be a good
Religion ? if Scripture as each one
vnderſtands it be not our Rule o
faith ; if we muſt be conſtrained t
believe Scripture not as wee vnder
ſtand it ; but as it is vnderſtood
by this or that Congregation ; wh
difference betwixt vs and Papiſts
They muſt believe Scripture as i
terpreted by the Pope, and Counci
have ever ſo much light from God
be ever ſo wiſe and witty, you mu
depoſe your own judgment , a
ſubmit to that of the Pope, Counc
and Popish Church: to this paſs
are come alſo; wee muſt believe t
kings ſupremacie , Epiſcopacy ,
gurative preſence tho perhaps we
not judge by Scripture it be t
Doctrin ; wee are conſtrained by P
nal laws, and Acts of Parliament
believe them , as Papiſts by the
Inquiſition ; and why ? becauſe t
Church of England vnderſtands
Scripture, its true ; and if you , repl
you do not interpret Scripture
you'l not be heard ; you muſt ſubm

an

and believe againſt your iudgment; and what's this but plain Popish Tyrany ouer mens conſciences? Did Luther and Calvin forſake the Pope and Councils, for to ſubmit their judgments to any other? No, but to follow Scripture as each one of them vnderſtood it: and tho Luther was a man rayſed by God and replenisht with his ſpirit to repair the ruins of the Church; yet Calvin did no more ſubmit to him, than Luther did to the Pope; nor did Zuinglius ſubmit to Calvin, but followed his own ſenſe of Scripture; nor did Oecolampadius ſubmit to Zuinglius; but every one ſearched the Scripture, believed and taught what they thought to be true; and thus we became a Reformation of Popery: if therefore we will continue a Reformation, and walk by the ſpirit of our firſt bleſſed Reformers; wee muſt not be conſtrained to believe any mans ſenſe of Scripture: we muſt believe whatever we think to be true, and have no other Rule of faith but Scripture as each one vnderſtands it.

Iſmael. And what then? what do

you inferr from this discourse?

Isaac. This consequence, that wheras no true Child of the Reformation, be he of what Congregation you will, can justly deny our Rule of faith to be Scripture as any Person of sound judgment interprets it; it follows vnauoidably that the Doctrin of the Reformation is, *Whatever any Person of sound judgment interprets to be the true sense of Scripture*, and whatever Luther, Calvin, Beza, or any other of sound judgment in the Reformation, since its first ryse vntill this day, taught to be the true sense of Scripture, is to be called and esteemed the Doctrin of the Reformation, tho to others of this or that Congregation it may seem to be wicked and scandalous Doctrin.

And now let me answer to an objection you made against this Principle in our entrance to this discourse: you objected that many Papish Drs and *Casuists* delivered scandalous and base Doctrins, which the Papists will not admit to be the Doctrin of their Church, tho delivered by Papish Drs; and thence you pre-

tended, that the particular ſentiments of privat Drs of the Reformation are not to be called the Doctrin of our Church. But be pleaſed to obſerve the difference betwixt Popery and our Reformation; the Rule of faith in Popery is, Scripture as interpreted by the Pope and Council, or their Church; they will admit no other; conſequently no Doctrin is to be called Popery but what is judged by the Pope and his Church or Council to be the ſenſe of Scripture; and if any Dr or Univerſitie holds any ſenſe contrary to theirs; it is to be called the Doctrin of that particular perſon, and not the Doctrin of the Popish Church; becauſe their Rule of faith is not Scripture as interpreted by any Perſon of ſound judgment; but as interpreted by their Pope and Council. But wheras our Rule of faith in the Reformation, is Scripture as each perſon of ſound judgment interprets it; whatever Doctrin or ſenſe is ſaid by any man to be of Scripture, is juſtly to be called the Doctrin of the Reformation: for example, Melancton, a man of ſound judgment,

great learning, and of an vpright conſcience. taught Bigamy to be the Doctrin of ſcripture; Beza taught, the Lords ſupper might be adminiſter'd in any kind of victuals, as well as in bread and wine: Calvin taught, that Chriſt deſpaired on the Croſs, and ſuffered the pains of hell after his death: why then, let all the Bishops and Univerſities of England condemn this Doctrin; let all the Synods of France and Germany decry it; the Doctrin will be ſtill of the Reformation; becauſe its Scripture as interpreted by men of ſound judgment.

Iſmael. The heate of your diſcourſe has tyred you; and my memorie is ſufficiently loaden with what you have ſaid; let me digeſt it in my privat retirement, and wee will meet again.

Iſaac. Content; carrie with you theſe three points, which I have proved convincingly: firſt *our Rule of faith* is Scripture, not as interpreted by this or that, but by any man of ſound judgment; ſecondly it follows hence that the Doctrin of the Reformation, muſt be and ought to

be called whatever any man of ſound judgment ſaies is the ſenſe of ſcripture: thirdly it follows, wee may change Religions as often as wee pleaſe.

III. DIALOGUE.

Ismael. I remember well the ſummary of your laſt diſcourſe, given me in three points; and I find the ſecond to be abſurd, and repugnant to reaſon: you'l neuer perſwade it, tho you have pleaded for it with great energy; what? if a ſilly Woman, Cobler, or other tradeſman reade Scripture and giue their ſenſe of it, that, forſooth, muſt be called the Doctrin of the Reformation? and it ſhall be lawfull for them to believe it againſt the Doctrin of the whole Church?

Iſaac. Do not limit Gods infinit goodneſs, by meaſuring his mercies towards his Creatures with your narrow apprehenſions: take notice he

saies, he has choſen the weake and contemptible of the world for to confound the ſtrong ones: *I confeſs vnto you Father, that you have hid theſe things from the wiſe and prudent, and haſt revealed them to the little ones.* And therefore he chooſed poore ſimple fiſhermen to be his Apoſtles: I know it's the practiſe of Papiſts, and from them your Church of England borrows it, to deſpiſe the Miniſtery of Women, tradeſmen, and illiterate people in preaching teaching and interpreting Scripture; but S. Paul tells vs *The word of God is not bound*, that's to say, is not entayl'd on the learned, rich, or great ones, the *Wind bloweth where it liſteth*: but Biſhops and Miniſters would make a Monopoly of the Word of God, and have themſelves to be the only Retailers of it; for to have ſom plauſible title for to enjoy great Rents and ſheare the flock: but wee have ſeen, as well among the Quakers, as in other Congregations, ſilly women and Tradeſmen repleniſht with Gods Spirit, preach and expound the great Miſteries of our Religion

Matt. 11.

Tim. 2.

Io. 3.

with as much of good succeſs and edification of the Auditory, as any *Penny-booke* Man in England.

Iſmael. It ſeems you approue the Miniſterie of Women and ſilly Tradeſmen for preaching and teaching the flock; and if ſo, you'l ouerthrow our Hierarchy of Biſhops and Miniſters.

Iſaac. It matters not much for you to know, what I approve or condemn; but to know what the Doctrin of the Reformation is; It's this; that none can teach, preach, adminiſter Sacraments; or exerciſe Eccleſiaſtical functions if he be not in holy Orders, Biſhop, Miniſter or Deacon; for the Church of England teachs it, and you may believe it if you pleaſe. You may alſo deny it; and ſay, any Woman or tradeſman has as much power for to preach and adminiſter the Sacraments as the richeſt Biſhop in England: this alſo is the Doctrin of the Reformation as well as the former, becauſe Quakers, Preſbyterians, Browniſts; Anabaptiſts, &c. believe and teach it, and they are men of as ſound judgments, and as

good Reformeds as Protestants; nay the most learned of our Reformers teach and commend the power of Women for to exercise Spiritual functions, and administer the Sacraments: [a] Saumaise, Peter Martyr, and [b] Zuinglius expressly defend the Priesthood as well of Women as of Men: and Luther proves it efficaciously; *The first office of a Priest*, saies he, *is to preach, this is common to all, euen women; the second is to baptize; which is also common to women; the third is to consecrat the bread and wine, and this also is common to all as well as to men; and in the absence of a Priest, a woman may absolve from sins as well as the Pope, because the words of Christ, whatsoeuer yee shall vntye on earth, shall be vntyed in heauen, were said to all Christians.*

[a] In lib. ad Corin. c. 11.

[b] In Explan. Art. 17.

[c] To. 2. de ministr. Eccles. inst t fol. 369 & lib. de Capt. Babyl. c. de Ordin. & lib. de abroganda Missa.

And when so eminent men have not said it, reason and Scripture convinces it; *Reason*, because that our Rule of faith being Scripture and each Person of sound judgment vnderstands it, many women vndoubtedly are of sound judgment, and why should not their interpretation

of Scripture pass for the Doctrin of the Reformation, as well as that of our Bishops and Ministers: *Scripture*, because wee reade the *Samaritan* Woman was the first who preached the *Messias* to the Cittie of *Samaria*, and Christ commanded Mary Magdalen to go to preach his Resurrection to his Disciples, and wee Know by our Cronicles that our glorious Queen Elizabeth of blessed memory, did not only gouern the state, but was a great Apostoless in Church affaires.

Ismael. To what purpose then, have wee Bishops and Ministers, who enjoy so vast reuenews, if any man or woman can preach and administer the Sacraments as well as they.

Isaac. You may believe, Bishops and Ministers are very needfull for the service of the Church; for they being commonly learned witty men, and having Wyves, they come to instruct their wyves so well, that the good women com in a short time to be as learned as their husbands, and as nimble and quick in the Eccleſiastical Ministeries as they, if they were permitted to exercise them; as som Au-

thors of credit relate vnto vs, tha
a Gentleman of *Conſtance*, writ t
his friend in a Village (about thre
leagues diſtant from that Cittie,
whoſe inhabitants were for the mo
part of our Lutheran Reformation
the good Paſtor exhorted his floc
to prepare for Eaſter Communion
and that none ſhould preſume
come to the holy Table, but ſhou
firſt confeſs and receive abſolutio
of his ſins: Eaſter holy dayes bei
come, ſuch a multitude flocxt to co
feſſion, that the Paſtor could not
tisfie the devotion of ſo great a cro
he called his wife to help him,
to hear Confeſſions, and give abſ
lutions, in wich Miniſterie the go
Lady did labour with great ſat
faction of the Penitents; but neith
the Paſtor nor his virtuous Conſo
being able to diſpatch ſo great a m
titude, he called his Maide Servant
who did worx in the holy Miniſte
with as much expedition as her M
ſter. But for all this, the Church
Scotland, France and all England
(Proteſtants excepted) will tell yo
that Biſhops and Miniſters are no

needfull; nay that they are very prejudicious to the *Reformation* and *State*; To the *Reformation*, becauſe this Hierarchy with the BishopsCourt, ſurplices Corner Caps, and other trumperies, puts the flock in mind of Popery, wherof its a perfect reſemblance; and whylſt the Papiſts ſee our change from them, comes to be almoſt no more but to ſubſtitute new Prieſts and Bishops in their own place, for to manage more conſcienciouſly the Rents and reuenews which they profanely abuſed; and that thoſe Rents and revenews are ſtill in the hands of an Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchie; they live in hopes of recovering them ſom day, when our Bishops and Miniſters will come to be as bad ſtewards of them as they were; and that the flock will be weary of them, and call back the Ancient Poſſeſſors: is therefore perhaps the Emiſſaries of the Pope do inceſſantly blow in our eares; how ill our Eccleſiaſtical revenews are beſtowed, for to maintain wyves and Children, Pomp and vanitie of Bishops and Miniſters; no leſs than in Popery. To the *State*,

they seem to be prejudicious, where any but a Bishop or Minister, would think, it would be more advantagious to the Common-wealth, that the king should have those Revenews for to maintain his fleet and armie, and ease thereby the subjects of subsidies and taxes, than that a hand full of Bishops and Ministers should have them especially when others can preach and teach as well as they, for nothing, but the pleasure of being hea d.

Ismael. But do not you see it would be a Sacrileдge that the king should deprive the Clergy of their Church Revenews.

Isaac. And do not you know, that almost all our Congregations do hold our Clergy to be no true Clergy, but as meer laymen as you or I; that admit no Clergy or Episcopal Character; But *Elders* chosen by the Congregation: and if they be no true Clergy, they have no right to the Church Revenews, and its no sacrileдge to deprive them of them. The Popish Clergy in Henry the VIII. time, had visibly a greater right to them, than ours now have: for neither

neither the king himſelf nor any other did doubt of their Right, and now moſt of our Congregations, do abſolutly deny any Right in our Clergy to thoſe Rents; becauſe they are no Clergy: yet none will be ſo bold, as to accuſe Henry the VIII. of ſacriledge, for hauing taken the Church Liuings from them, for to put them to better vſe. And why ſhould wee dare ſay, our King would commit any, for depriving our Clergy of thoſe Rents: believe he can lawfully do it; or believe he can not, you'l be ſtill a good Child of the Reformation. Believe what you pleaſe.

Iſmael. This is a tickliſh point; let's leaue it to the conſideration of our wiſe and prudent Parliament; and be pleaſed to anſwer to my doubt; how can wee live in peace and tranquillitie in Religion, if our Rule of faith be Scripture as each one vnderſtands it: I remember a diſcourſe ſtarted in the houſe of Lords, not many yeares agon, by his Grace the Duke of *Buckingam*; he deſired to know, what was it to be a Proteſtant; wherin did Pro-

teſtancy properly conſiſt? the Biſhops, who were preſent looked one vpon an other, and whether, they feared the difficultie of the queſtion, or that for modeſty's ſake, each expected to hear an other ſpeake firſt; they ſtood ſylent for a whyle; at laſt the yce was broken by one; others followed; but hardly any two agreed; and all that the Duke could gather out of their ſeveral anſwers, was that our Rule of faith, was Scripture as each one vndeſtood it; and Proteſtancy nothing but Scripture as interpreted by the Parliament and Church of England: whervpon he concluded, Wee are theſe hundred yeares very buſy for to ſettle Religion, and for ought I perceive, we are as vnſettled now as at the beginning: And truly he had great reaſon; for, Religion and faith is nothing elſe, but that ſenſe of Scripture, which each Perſon of ſound judgment vnderſtands; and as it's impoſſible wee ſhould all jump and agree in one ſenſe and meaning of the text, ſo its impoſſible wee ſhall euer be ſettled and agree in Religion.

Isaac. The reason of our vnsettlement hitherto and at present, is the violent efforts, what by persecutions, Acts of Parliaments, and other oppressions; what by Invectives, intrigues, and cabals of the Church of England, to draw all to be Protestants; of the Presbyterians, to make vs deny Episcopacy; and of each other Congregation, to force vs to their respective Tenets: and whylst this constraint and severity is vsed against mens consciences, its in vain to expect peace or settlement in our Reformed Church: but let vs follow our Rule of faith; let each one believe as in his conscience he best vnderstands Scripture; let vs all believe what wee please, and be permitted so to do; and wee shall without doubt enjoy perfect peace and Tranquillity: believe you *Figurative Presence*, if you will; let the Lutheran believe his *Real Presence*, if he likes it; and let me believe *no Presence* at all, if I judge ther's none; why will not you permit me to follow that Rule of faith which the whole Reformation, euen the Church

of England gives me in her 39. Articles, *Scripture as each Person of sound judgment vnderstands it.* To say, wee can neuer have settlement in Religion, whylst this arbitrary interpretation of Scripture is permitted, is to speake like a Papist: this the Pope and Papists said to our first blessed Reformers; and the Popish Church saies this day to vs; that wee ought to submit our judgments to the Church and Councils; that wee ought not to believe what sense wee think to be true, but what the Pope and Councils propose vnto vs; and if Luther and our other Reformers did not do ill, in follwing their own sense and interpretation of Scripture against all the world, why do you blame me or any other for following their example?

Ismael. When you speake of our Reformation and Congregations, I heare you reckon the Arians, Socinians, and Antitrinitarians among them; sure you do not belieue they, or such like ancient condemned hereticks, were of the Reformation; for wee Protestants do believe the Myf-

tery of the Trinity againſt them, and will never own them to be our Brethren.

Iſaac. And, do not you believe Epiſcopacy againſt the Presbyterians; ſom Canonical Books againſt the Lutherans; Supremacy againſt the Quakers, and Infants Baptiſm againſt the Anabaptiſts; and yet you own them as your Brethren and godly Congregations of the Reformation; or if you will deny them, they will alſo ſcorn you, and ſay they are more of the Reformation than you are; and why will not you own the Arians, &c. as your Brethren tho you believe the Trinitie againſt them? you ſay they are *old condemn'd Hereriks*; and does this language becom a Child of the Reformed Church? by whom were they condemn'd? was it not by the Popish Church, which alſo condemns vs, and ſaies wee are as much Hereticks as they; and as wee ought not to be ſo called, and judge the Pope and Councils ſentence againſt vs to be bold, vncharitable, and injuſt; ſo wee muſt ſay of the Arians, Pela-

gians and others condemn'd by them. You saie Protestants will never own them to be their Brethren; God forbid the Protestant Church should be so vncharitable to their fellow Christians, and so injust to themselves. B. Morton,) as I cited in my first Dialogue) as learned a man as the Church of England bred, saies the Arian Church is a true Church, and will say no less of the others: but what need wee the testimonie of any, for what reason so convincingly proves; They who walk by one and the same Rule of faith, are of one and the same Religion, therefore Lutherans, Protestants, Presbyterians and Independents do esteem themselves to be of the same faith and Religion, because they all have the same Rule, which is Scripture as each Congregation vnderstands it also notwithstanding the difference and varietie of Congregations in Popery; they hold all but one faith as they say; because they have all but one Rule of their beliefe, which is their infallible Pope and Church: but it's evident that those which ye

call, *Ancient condemned Hereticks*; have one and the same Rule of faith with our Reformation; for ours is Scripture as each Person of sound judgment vnderstands it; without any obligation of holding the sense of it delivered by Pope, Church, Councils or any other; therefore our first blessed Reformers did not care what sense of it, the Church or Pope did hold when they began to preach the purity of the Ghospel; but each of them interpreted it as he thought fit in the Lord, and so purged the Church of many Errors: This is the very self same Rule of faith, which Arians, Pelagians, Nestorians, and others, peremptorily condemned by Rome as Hereticks, did follow and walk by: each of them read and interpreted Scripture, preached and believed what sense of it they tought to be true, tho they knew it was against the Doctrin of the Church, looking on Scripture alone as their Rule of faith, without any regard of the Pope, Church, Councils, or Fathers: The Church of Rome proud and impatient of any opposition, con-

demned them as Hereticks for not
submitting their judgments to her
for takeing Scripture as they vn-
derstood it, and not as the Church
and Councils vnderstood it, for their
Rule of faith; and if this be a crime
wee are as guiltie as they; wee
are equally nocent or innocent; wee
are both Hereticks, or none is; wee
are therefore concern'd in their ho-
nor and ought to defend the inte-
grity of their procedure against the
Common enemy which is the Pope:
they were *Reformers* of the Church
in their times, as wee are in ours
and wheras thy have the same Rule
of faith; so they have the same Re-
ligion with the Reformation.

Ismael. Then, you will say Ari-
nism is the Doctrin of the Reform-
tion, and wee may lawfully believe it.

Isaac. I say God's Unitie in Na-
ture and Trinity in Persons is the
Doctrin of the Reformation, becau-
the Protestant, Lutheran, and Ho-
gonot Church, judge by Scripture it
is true; and if you judge also by
Scripture its the true Doctrin, you
may believe it: I say also if you

judge by Scripture this Myſtery is not true, you may ſafely deny it according the Principles of the Reformation, and be ſtill as good a member of the Reformed Church, as they who believe it; for whoeuer believes what he judges by Scripture to be true, is a true Reformed: and, that the denyal of the Trinitie is as much the Doctrin of the Reformation as the belief of it; it appears not only becauſe it was the Doctrin of the Arians, who as I proved are truly of the Reformed Church; but becauſe it was taught by the greateſt Ligths of our Church: [d] Calvin ſaies the text, *My Father is greater than I, muſt be vnderſtood of Chriſt, not only as he is Man, but alſo as he is God.* And that the Council of Nice did abuſe the text: [e] *My Father and I are one, for to prove the Vnity of both in Nature; wheras it only ſignifies their Vnity by conformity of Will.* Again he ſaies Epiſt. 2. ad Polon. in tract. Theol. pag. 796. That prayer, *Holy Trinity one God have mercy of vs, is barbarous, and does not pleaſe me.* And ads [f] *The ſon has his own*

[d] In Harm. in Matth. c. 26 verſ. 64. & in admonad Polan. in Tract. Theolog. pag. 794.

[e] Comment. ſuper Ioan. c. 10.

[f] In Act.

Servetipag. 87.

substance distinct from the Father. His Disciple Danæus [g] saies, *its a foolish insipid prayer*: and our great Apostle Luther (who as *Fox* witnesseth, was the Chariot and conductor of Israel, and a man extraordinarily raised and repleniſht with Gods spirit, to teach the purity of the Ghospel) caused that prayer to be blotted out of the Litanies. [h] *That word Trinity, saies he, sounds coldly; my soule hates that word Homousion, and the Arian did well in not admitting it.* Lastly Ochinus that great Oracle of England impugns this Mysterie with a strong discourse: [i] *Wee are not obliged to believe, saies he, more than the Saints of the Ancient Testament, otherwise our condition would be worse than theirs; but they were not obliged to believe this Mystery; therefore we are not obliged.* Examin I pray the works of these eminent Drs. where I quote them; consider if they be not, not only men of sound judgment, but men extraordinarily raised by God, (saies the Synod of Charenton; the chariots and conductors of Israel, saies Fox: men to be re-

[g] l. cont. Genebrar.

[h] In Postil. Major. in enarrat. Evang. Domin. Trinit.

[i] lib. 2. Dial. 2.

verenc'd after Christ, saies our Dr Powel, and Apostolical Oracles sent to teach vs the purity of the Ghospell; and conclude, its an vndeniable Veritie that this is the Doctrin of the Reformation, wheras it's Scripture as interpreted by such men: O! but England France and Scotland believes this Mysterie; well? and what then? that proves that the Mysterie is also the Doctrin of the Reformation, becauſe whateuer any Man of sound judgment thinks to be Scripture, is its Doctrin; but is England or France alone the whole Reformation? are not Luther, Caluin, Danæus, Ochinus as well of the Reformation; and men of as sound judgment as they? since therefore they vnderstand by Scripture ther's no Trinitie, its the Doctrin of the Reformation also that ther's none: believe it or deny it, which you like best, and you'l be still of the Reformed Church.

Ismael. By the Principle you run vpon, you may say any blasphemy is the Doctrin of the Reformation, for ther's hardly any so execrable,

Setueti pag. 87.: *ſubſtance diſtinct from the Father.* His Diſciple Danæus [g] ſaies, *its a fooliſh inſipid prayer:* and our great Apoſtle Luther (who as *Fox* witneſſeth, was the Chariot and conductor of Iſrael, and a man extraordinarily raiſed and repleniſht with Gods ſpirit, to teach the purity of the Ghoſpel) cauſed that prayer to be blotted out of the Litanies. [h] *That word Trinity, ſaies he, ſounds coldly; my ſoule hates that word Homouſion, and the Arian did well in not admitting it.* Laſtly Ochinus that great Oracle of England impugns this Myſterie with a ſtrong diſcourſe: [i] *Wee are not obliged to believe, ſaies he, more than the Saints of the Ancient Teſtament, otherwiſe our condition would be worſe than theirs; but they were not obliged to believe this Myſtery; therefore we are not obliged.* Examin I pray the works of theſe eminent Drs. where I quote them; conſider if they be not, not only men of ſound judgment, but men extraordinarily raiſed by God, (ſaies the Synod of Charenton; the chariots and conductors of Iſrael, ſaies Fox: men to be re-

g l. cont. Genebrar.

h In Poſtil. Majo. in enarrat. Evang. Domin. Trinit.

i lib. 2. Dial. 2.

verenc'd after Christ, saies our Dr Powel, and Apostolical Oracles sent to teach vs the purity of the Ghospell; and conclude, its an vndeniable Veritie that this is the Doctrin of the Reformation, wheras it's Scripture as interpreted by such men: O! but England France and Scotland believes this Mysterie; well? and what then? that proves that the Mysterie is also the Doctrin of the Reformation, becauſe whateuer any Man of sound judgment thinks to be Scripture, is its Doctrin; but is England or France alone the whole Reformation? are not Luther, Caluin, Danæus, Ochinus as well of the Reformation; and men of as sound judgment as they? since therefore they vnderstand by Scripture ther's no Trinitie, its the Doctrin of the Reformation also that ther's none: believe it or deny it, which you like best, and you'l be still of the Reformed Church.

Ismael. By the Principle you run vpon, you may say any blasphemy is the Doctrin of the Reformation; for ther's hardly any so execrable,

but ſom Dr of ours has delivered and taught it.

Iſaac. The Principle I run vpon is this, Scripture as each Perſon of ſound judgment interprets it, is our Rule of faith: judge you, if that be not a good Principle in our Reformed Church; wheras this is the Rule of faith given vs by the 39. Articles and generally by all our Drs as I proved in my firſt Dialogue: this being our Rule of faith and Reformed Doctrin, its evident, that whatever Doctrin is judged by any Perſon of ſound judgment to be contained in Scripture, is the Doctrin of our Reformation: ſom Perſons of ſound judgement ſay the *Real Preſence* is expreſſed by Scripture; this therefore is the Doctrin of the Reformation; others ſay, only *Figurative Preſence* is taught in Scripture; this alſo is the Doctrin of the Reformation; ſom vnderſtand by Scripture, there is a Myſterie of the bleſſed Trinitie; this therefore is the Doctrin of the Reformation; others vnderſtand ther's no ſuch Myſterie; this alſo is the Doctrin of the Reformation;

tion: ſo that whether you believe or deny this or any other Tenet controverted, you'l ſtill hold the Doctrin of the Reformation.

Iſmael. Calvin [k] ſaies *Chriſt prai'd vnaduiſedly, the Eve of his Paſſion; that he vttered words wherof he was afterward ſorry, that in his paſſion he was ſo troubled of all ſides, that ouerwhelm'd with deſperation, he deſiſted from invoking God, which was to renunce all hopes of ſalvation:* And ſaies he, *I if you object its abſurd and ſcandalous to affirm Chriſt deſpaired, I anſwer, this deſperation proceeded from him as he was man, not as he was God.* And this is not only the Doctrin of Calvin, but of Brentius, [m] Marlotus, [n] Jacobus Miniſter (quoted by Bilſon) and of Beza. will you ſay this is the Doctrin of the Reformation, or that wee can without ſcruple believe it? Alſo Calvin ſaies, [o] *That Chriſt's corporal death was not ſufficient for to redeem vs, but that after hauing deſpaired on the Croſs, he ſuffered the death of his ſoule; that's to ſay, that his ſoule after his corporal death, ſuffered the pains of the damn'd*

k Harm. in Evang. Mat c. 26 verſ. 39. & c. 27 verſ. 46. & lib. 2. Inſtit. c. 16 ſect. 10. & 11.

l In Luc. par. 2. hom. 65. & in Ioan. hom. 54.

m In Matth. c. 26.

n In Recogn. pag. 376.

o lib. 2. Inſt. c. 16. ſect. 10. & ſeq.

in hell. And saies he in the same place, *they are but ignorant doltish brutish men, who will deny it.* Luther also teachs the same Doctrin: *As he suffered with exceeding pains the death of the Body, so it seems he suffered afterward the death of his soule in hell:* Epinus a learned Lutheran saies, *Christ descended into hell for thee, and suffered not only corporal death, but the death and fire of hell.* Mr. Fulk and Parkins avow this is also the express Doctrin of Illiricus, Latimer and Lossius. Also Luther most impiously affirms, that *not only the human nature of Christ dyed for us, but also his Divin nature:* see Luther's words quoted at large by Zuinglius and Hospinian: If you say such scandalous blasphemies may be falsly believed, you will render your Christianitie suspected; and if you say, that they are the Doctrin of the Reformation, or that they may be believed according the Principles of the Reformation; you will make the Reformation and its Principles to be hated by any good Christian.

p To. 3. Wittemb. in sp. 16.

q in ps. 16.

r In Confes. majori de Cœna Dñi.

s To. 2. in respõs. ad Confes. Luth. fol. 458.

t In Histor Sacram. par. 2. fol. 57.

Isaac. If I walk by the Rule

faith of the Reformation, I'l prove my ſelf a true Reformed Child; and if I prove my ſelf to be a Reformed Child, my Chriſtianity cannot be juſtly ſuſpected. What Tenet have you related of all thoſe which you call blaſphemies and ſcandals: but has been judged by thoſe Eminent Drs. of our Reformation to be expreſs Scripture, or conformable to Scripture; and ſince our Rule of faith is Scripture as each perſon of ſound judgment vnderſtands it, and ſince the Doctrin of our Reformation is but whatever any ſuch Perſon of ſound judgment, judges to be expreſſed in, or proved by Scripture; its evident that all thoſe Tenets are vndeniably the Doctrin of the Reformation: I ſay then, and will ſay without any offence to my Chriſtianity, or blemish to our Reformed Church; that thoſe Tenets are the Doctrin of the Reformation and may be as ſafely believed by any Child of it, as Figurative Preſence, ſupremacy, or Two Sacraments: and let not any *Bigot* pretend to freghten me from this Doctrin, by calling it *blaſphemy*

and *impiety*; No, its Scripture as interpreted by our renowned Reformed Doctors; therefore its no blasphemy: let any man convince me, that our Rule of faith must not be Scripture as each Person of sound judgment vnderstands it; and he will convince that this cannot be justly called the Doctrin of the Reformation; but whylst that Principle and Rule of faith stands vnshaken, nothing that is taught by any Person of sound judgment to be the Doctrin of Scripture, but is to be called our Doctrin, and may be safely believed.

You say that whoeuer has any loue for Christianity, will hate the Reformation and its Principles, if they give libertie for to believe such blasphemies: but, can any mother be more indulgent to her Child than the Reformation is to vs? such as think those Tenets to be blasphemies, the Reformation gives them leave not to believe them; and if any judges by Scripture, that they are not blasphemies but pure Doctrin; as Luther, Calvin and others did, they

have liberty for to believe them. He who denyes them, cannot in charity check them who believe them; nor can they who believe them, check those who deny them, wheras each follow our Rule of faith, and believe what they judge by Scripture to be true. And if you or your Church of England cry out *Blasphemy*, *Blasphemy*, against all that you judge to be fals; why do not you cry blasphemie against Presbyterians, Lutherans and other Congregations from whom you dissent? and what difference betwixt you and the Church of Rome? the folly of this is to call Heresy and blasphemy all that is not her own Doctrin: and all that your Church of England mystikes, must be *fanaticism*, *blasphemy*, and impiety? must our Rule of faith be Scripture as the Church of England vnderstands it, and not otherwise? Presbyterians and Lutherans will neuer allow it: if therefore our Rule of faith be Scripture as each Person vnderstands it; any Person of sound judgment in the Reformation, may without scrupule believe what he

vnderſtands to be the Doctrine of Scripture.

IV. DIALOGUE.

ISMAEL. You ſtill inſiſt vpon that Principle that our Rule of faith, is Scripture as each Perſon of ſound judgment vnderſtands it; and from that Principle will follow many abſurd conſequences deſtructive of piety and Religion.

Iſaac. That Principle is not invented by me; its of our holy Reformation; if I did diſcourſe with a Papiſt I would prove the Principle to be true and Gods expreſs Word; but ſince I diſcourſe with a Reformed Child, I ſuppoſe, and not ſpend my time in proving it: this Principle then, being an vnqueſtionable truth in our Reformation, no Reformed Child muſt be ſo irreverent and bold as to ſay, that any Doctrin which cleerly and vnauoidably follows out of it, is blaſphemous or impious, for that would be

to condemn our Principle by which we walk : *Ex vero non ſequitur niſi verum* : from a true Principle nothing can follow but true Doctrin: can you deny, but this was the Rule of faith and Principle of our firſt bleſſed Reformers, and of the Church of England mentioned in her 39. Articles ? if therefore they judged, and if any other judges by that Rule and Principle, that thoſe Tenets which you call impious and blaſphemous be true Doctrin ; they cannot be blamed for believing them.

Iſmael. I confeſs our firſt Reformers did ſpeake ſo, but J ſay ſuch Errors and impious Doctrins cannot without irreverence be called the Doctrin of the Reformation and cannot without impiety be belieued ; becauſe our Reformation, at preſent condemns and deteſts thoſe blaſphemies , for we muſt grant , that our Reformation in its beginning was not in its full perfection of Doctrin ; God began it by Luther , Caluin , Zuinglius and others : thoſe great men ha their fraylties ; they did ouerlash in ſom

things; and what they said amiss, Gods heavenly spirit inspired to the Church from time to time to correct it, and has at length brought our Church to that purity of Doctrin, and fullness of perfection which now it enjoyes: Nothing is to be called now the Doctrin of the Reformation, but what is now believed by our Congregations, and none of them believes those execrable Tenets you related.

Isaac. you wrong the Reformation very much, in saying it had not its full perfection in the beginning, its rather to be thought, that that polishing and refining of it in ensuing years with new perfections, and correcting the first draught of it by our first Reformers, has been a corruption of it with som mixture of Popish errors and superstitions: for all religious Congregations, and Pretenders to piety, are at the first beginning in the height of their perfection, and in progress of years they decline and decay from their primitive Spirit into errors and corruption of manners: Religious Con-

gregations are not like *Arts* and *Sciences*, which by tyme and experience receive new perfefections; but like chimnies, which grow dayly blacker by continual ſmoke and fire: witneſs the Jewiſh Church and law, in its beginning, florishing and holy, but corrupted in progreſs of time by Traditions of men and ſuperſtitions of Phariſees: witneſs alſo the law of the Ghoſpell in thoſe happy tymes of the Apoſtles, holy and pure, but corrupted after ſom years by errors of Popery: Jf wee be to ſeek for the pure and Orthodox Doctrin of the primitive Church; ought not we to be ſaid by the Apoſtles, men raiſed extraordinaryly by God and replenisht with his Spirit to teach vs the Ghospell? and if wee be to ſeek for the pure and Orthodox Doctrin of the Reformation, ought not wee to be ſaid rather by Luther, Calvin, Melancton, Zuinglius, Beza and our other firſt Reformers, than by a few Miniſters and Bishops of England, who, tho they be wiſe and pious men, yet they are not of that ſtamp as the others. And if our pre-

ſent Congregations preſume to correct them, and ſay they ouerlasht in their Doctrin; will not the Papiſts ſay; if they have been ſuch ſcandalous Maſters and falſe teachers, why did you receive their Reformation, and as they erred ſo groſly in ſuch prime articles of Chriſtianity, why do not you feare and ſuſpect, they have alſo erred in the reſt? ſecondly the Papiſts will ſay, if as they reformed vs, you reform them; then you muſt expect and permit, that others may reform you; and forſake your Doctrin, as you forſake theirs.

Iſmael. I wiſh you could make out, that the Reformation was in its full perfection in its beginning; had you read ſom Writers of ours, perhaps you would judge otherwiſe; [a] Muſculus, a learned Lutheran writes thus, *Thus it is with vs at preſent, that if any be deſirous to ſee a great rabble of knaues turbulent Spirits, deceitfull perſons, Coſeners and debauch men, let him go to a City where the Ghoſpel is purely preached, and he ſhall find them by*

[a] Dom 2. Adventus, & libr de Proph. Chriſti.

multitudes; for its more manifeſt than the day light, that never were there more vnbridled and vnruly people among the turks and other infidels than the Profeſſors of the Reformed Ghoſpel. Luther himſelf ſaies as much; *The world grows dayly worſe, and men are now more couetous, revengefull, and lycentious than they were in Popery.* Mr. Stubs [c] ſayes no leſs: *After my travells round about all England, I found the people in moſt parts proud, malicious, ambitious and careleſs of good works*: Mr Richard Geferie in his Sermon at St. Pauls Croſs printed in: 1604. *I may freely ſpeake what I have plainly ſeen, that in Flanders never was there more drunkneſs, in Italy more wantonneſs, in Iury more hypocriſy, in Turkie more impiety; in Tartary more iniquity, than is practis'd generally in England, and particularly in London.* Certainly our Reformation at preſent deſerues a better caracter; never did the Alehouſes and Taverns complain more heauily of want of trading; which is a proof of our Sobriety: the Churches which we ſee a building in London, is a

[b] In Poſtill. ſuper Evangel. Domi. 1. Advent: & Dom. 26. poſt Trinit.

[c] Motiues to Good Works in the Epiſt. Dedic.

good testimony of piety; and we are so farr from any smack of hypocrisy, that you shall not see in all London the least appearance of Virtue, so hiddenly its kept from mortal Eyes, but what you may meet in our honests Quakers.

Isaac. I confess our Congregations as now they are, are very good both in Doctrin and manners; but I say also, that the Doctrin and manners of our Reformation at its first beginning was as pure, as holy, and as true as now it is, or ever it will be. Nay supposing and granted, their manners and Doctrin were so corrupt as those Drs. mention; I say that amidst all those vices, their life was as holy, innocent, blamless and pure as yours is now: and that you may be convinc't of this truth, know that Calvin expressly teachs: [d] *We believe, the sins of the faithfull* (by means of the Reformation) *are but venial sins; not but that they deserve death, but because there is no damnation for the Children of Grace, in so much as their sins are not imputed to them*; And again [e] he saies, *We*

[d] lib. 3. Inst c. 4. sect. 28.

[e] lib. 4.

can

can assure ourselves, wee can no more be damn'd for any sins, than Iesus-Christ himself. Luther [f] is of the same opinion, *As nothing but faith doth justifie vs, so nothing but incredulity is a sin.* Again [g] *No sin is so great that it can condemn a man; such as are, damn'd are damn'd only for their incredulitie:* Whitaker, [h] *No sin can hurt a man who has faith.* The same is taught by Wotten, Fulk, Tindal, and Beza. Its therefore the Doctrin of Scripture, as interpreted by these Persons of great and sound judgment, that incests, murthers, intemperance or whateuer else you call a sin (incredulitie excepted) either is no sin at all, or but venial sins, which do no harm, nor cannot damn the children of the Reformation; if therefore our Brethren lived in the beginning of the Reformation, as those authors relate; they liued according Scripture as interpreted to them by men of sound judgment, and this being our Rule of faith and manners, they did not ill but very well in following it.

Ismael. They were men of the

Inst. c. 7. sect. 2.

[f] In loc. commun. class 5 c. 27.

[g] To. 2. Wittemb. de capt. Babyl. fol. 74.

[h] de Eccl. cont. Bellarm. cōt. 2. quæst. 5

Reformation, its true, who taught these errors, and dissolution of life and good manners; in so much they swerued from the spirit of holynes and purity of the Reformation, and must not be believed nor commended: looke vpon the Reformation as now it is, and you will not find any such scandalous Doctrin or corruption of manners.

Isaac. They were not only men of the Reformation; but the greatest Oracles of it, which you will not match with any of our present congregations; and its not pardonable in any Reformed Child to say, such Oracles extrordinarily raised by God to teach the purity of the Gospel, should have taught either Errors in Doctrin, or dissolution of manners: they taught what in their conscience they vnderstood by Scripture to be true; if you will not be so irreverent as to say that they were knaves, who spoke and taught against their conscience and knowledge. Therefore they taught the Doctrin of the Reformation purely and truly: the consequence is euident:

for, what is the Doctrin of the Reformation, but what wise learned men of sound judgment think and vnderstand by Scripture to be true? why is figuratiue Presence the Doctrin of the Reformation, tho denied by Lutherans, (who are Reformed also) but because wise learned men judge by Scripture as they vnderstand it, its the true Doctrin? or can you give me any other Rule of faith, by which wee may know what Doctrin is of the Reformation, and what not, but Scripture as each Person of sound judgment vnderstands it? or what Rule can you give for to know what is good or euil to be don, but Scripture as vnderstood by such Persons: if therefore Luther, Calvin and the other Drs. J. quoted judge by Scripture that Doctrin, and manner of life to be true and good; why may not wee say its the Doctrin of the Reformation: if you or the Church of England, or Scotland judge that Doctrin to be false, and that manner of life to be a dissolution and corruption of manners: why; you

are men of ſound judgment ; you vnderſtand Scripture ſo ; that will be the Doctrin alſo of the Reformation, you may believe it : but you muſt not deny that Luther and Calvins Doctrin alſo is of the Reformation, becauſe they were men of as ſound a judgment as you.

You tranſgreſs haynouſly againſt modeſtie in ſaying thoſe ſacred Organs of God ſwerued from the ſpirit and holyneſs of the Reformation; which hauing no other Rule of faith but Scripture as each Perſon of ſound judgment vnderſtands it ; it's Spirit and holyneſs conſiſt in framing our life and Doctrin to that Rule, as our bleſſed Reformers and Reformation in its beginning did ; believing thoſe Tenets, which you call Errors and blaſphemy ; and liuing that life which you call Diſſolution and corruption of Manners ; becauſe they judge by Scripture, as they vnderſtood it, that Doctrin and manner of life was true, innocent and good; and if you like it as they did, you may believe, and liue as they did, and be a good Child of the Refor-

mation : consider I pray all the works and Doctrin of Luther, (the like I say of our other first Reformers) the three parts of his Doctrin is against Popery, and They say, all are Heresies and blasphemies ; the rest is contrary to the Church of England, and she saies, this is also Errors and blasphamie , so you conspire with the Papists to destroy the credit of our first and best Reformer ; and betwixt you both , you vnplume him of all his Feathers, and leaue him not a bit of good Doctrin.

But I will stand to the Spirit, and Principles of the Reformation and Congregations as now they are, since that you do so much boast of its purity and great Perfections ; and I will prove that Doctrin , and manner of life , may be believed and followed lawfully standing to its Principles : for if the Spirit of the Reformation be at present among vs, wee must not be forced, as in Popery to believe against our proper judgments , what others believe by Scripture to be true and holy ; but

what each one thinks in his own conscience to be such; because even now at present, our Rule of faith, is Scripture as each person of sound judgment vnderstands it, and this is the same Rule which Luther and the Reformation in its beginning had: this holy libertie is the best iewel, the greatest perfection, and most glorious prerogative the Reformation has: if therefore now at present any man judges by scripture, that he can marry ten wyves at a time; that he can kill his owne son as Abraham intended; that he may commit incest with his own Daughter, as Lot did; that there is no sin but incredulity, as Luther believed; nor any Mysterie of the Trinitie of Persons in one nature, as Calvin believed: with what justice can the Church of England say a man does not believe and live as becometh a Reformed Child, or that his Doctrin and life is scandalous? wheras he lives and believes as he vnderstands by Scripture he may or ought to do, which is the Rule of faith of the Reformation, even of the Church of England? the Church

of England saies, the Lutheran Doctrin of the real Presence, is not the Doctrin of Scripture; that the Presbyterian Doctrin against Episcopacy, is not the Doctrin of Scripture; that the Anabaptist Doctrin against infants Baptism, is not of Scripture; and yet you permit them all to live in peace; you confess they are true Children of the Reformation, tho dissenters from you; why? because they follow Scripture as they vnderstand it, and this is our Rule of faith: and why will not you say, the belief and life of that other man is also of the Reformation, tho absurd it may seem to you; since he believes and lives as he judges by Scripture he may: it follows therefore plainly that this is the Doctrin of the Reformation.

Ismael. I confess our Rule of faith in the Reformation, is Scripture as each person of sound judgment vnderstands it: but you cannot doubt but that its needfull to moderat and curb this libertie, or it may run too farr: for if every man be lycene't to believe and teach every thing he

fancies to be according Scripture; as there is no Doctrin so execrable but som ignorant Reader may hit vpon a text, which, ill vnderstood, may seem to favor it; so there will be none but may be believed, and called the Doctrin of the Reformation: for example Beza [i] teaches, (and saies its also the Doctrin of Calvin, Saumaize and Geneve,) that the Lords supper may be lawfully administer'd in any kind of victuals as well as in bread, and wine; in Eges, flesh, fish, &c. *Where there is no bread and wine*, saies he, *wee may duly celebrat, if insteed of them, we vse, what wee vsually eate and drink.* And again in the same place; *If there be no water at hand, and that baptism cannot be with edification differed I would baptize in any other liquor:* *Isaac.* and why should not it be lawfull to any Reformed to believe this, wheras its Scripture as interpreted by a man of so sound a judgment? but I do not in any wise like that opinion of yours and of the Church of England, that its convenient to limit and curb mens judgments least

[i] Epist. 2, 2. & 25.

they may run too farr: this is the Policy of Rome; They will not permit an arbitrary interpretation of Scripture, alleadging forsooth, for inconveniencie, the multitude of absurd Doctrins which the word would swarm with, if such a libertie were granted: No, No; far be it from any true Reformed Child to mislike or blame that all people should interpret Scripture, and believe what they judge by it to be true: and if what the judge to be true, should seem to you fals and scandalous; do not you believe it, but let them believe it, and they will be of the Reformation, becauſe they follow our Rule of faith.

Ismael. [k] Luther, [l] Melancton, [m] Musculus, [n] Ochinus, [o] Beza and others teach the lawfullneſs of Bigamy or multiplicity of wives, and prove it with the example of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob: and Ochinus expounding the text of S. Paul; *It behoueth a Bishop to be a man of one Wife: The prohibition saies he, is not to be vnderstood so, that a Bishop should have but one wife at a time for*

[k] To. 5. Wittemb. ferm. de Matrim. & in 1. ad Corint. 7.
[l] Consil. Theol. par. 1 pag 648. &
[m] In Epist Paul. ad Phil. & in 1. ad Tim. 3.
[n] lib. 2. Dial. 21.
[o] lib. de Repud. & Divort. pag. 123.

certainly he may have many; but S. Paul's meaning is, that he ought not to have too many wyves at a time; that's to say ten or twentie.

Isaac. And will you deny this to be the Doctrin of the Reformation, wheras its Scripture as interpreted by men of so eminent and sound a judgment?

Ismael. The synod of Geneve; [p] and the [q] Ecclesiastical Disciplin of France printed at Saumure, has decreed, that a wife whose husband is a long time absent, may have him called by the public Cryer, and if within competent time he does not appear, without any further enquiry, the Minister may lycence her to marry another, or marry her himself.

[p] Canon. generales Genuen. 1560.
[q] Chap. 8. art. 31.

Isaac. I say, all honest Women may practise this Doctrin without scruple or shame, wheras its Scripture as interpreted by that thrice holy synod: but let seamen beware how they undertake long voyages, for feare their Wyves may take other husbands in their absence.

Ismael. Luther [r] teachs its lawfull to a wife, if her husband does not

[r] To. 5. Wittem. serm. de Matrim.

pleaſe her, to call her Man ſervant; or her neighbour; which Doctrin they ſay is come to the eares of our London Siſters; and he gives the like libertie to the huſbands, if their Wyves be pettish and humorſom. *If the huſband* ſaies he, *cannot correct the humorſomneſs of his wife, he may imagin ſhe is dead, and may marry an other becauſe its not in the power of a Man to live without a Woman, nor in hers to live without a man.*

Iſaac. This is Scripture as interpreted by Luther, and conſequently muſt not be denied to be the Doctrin of the Reformation; nor can any of our Reformation be juſtly punisht or blam'd for practiſing it, if he judges by Scripture it be true, (as Luther did) for this is our Rule of faith. But Luther never gave this libertie, but vpon condition, that the huſband or wife ſhould firſt make their complaint before a Magiſtrat, for to have a redreſs of their injurie and diſcontent: but this condition ſeems too comberſom to the modeſtie of our ſiſters; they do not ſubmit to it, but do themſelves juſtice

[s] To. 5. Wittemb. ſerm. de Matrim. [t] In Scriptis Anglic. de Reg Chr. l. 2. c. 26. & in Math. c. 19 & in Conſil. Theol. par. 1 pag. 648 & 134. [x] Dial. 200. & 204 in Epiſt. s. Paul. ad Tim 3. [y] l. 4. Inſt. c. 19. ſect. 37. Diſcip. Eccl. c. 13.

without any addreſs to the Magiſtrat. I know alſo that not only Luther, but Bucer, [t] Melancton, [t] Ochinus, [x] Muſculus and Calvin do teach that a Man who finds his wife in Adulterie, may caſt her of by Divorce and marry an other; and our french ſynods have ordered this Doctrin to be put in their Eccleſiaſtical Diſciplin, ſo that its the Doctrin of Scripture as interpreted by theſe Perſons of ſound judgment, and conſequently of the Reformation: you may therefore believe and practiſe it; our Siſters, particularly our Miniſters wyves, were much alarm'd at this Doctrin, and ſay its à damnable Hereſy: believe as you pleaſe.

[x] ſerm. de Matrim.

Iſmael. Does not Luther ſay it impoſſible a yong man of 20 years can liue without a woman; or a yong maide of 18 years, without a man; whereby all Parents may believe their Daughters of that age are defiled, if not preferr'd in due time? ſure you will not ſay this is the Doctrin of the Reformation.

Iſaac. And who doubts but that its

its the Reformed Doctrin ; Scripture as interpreted by so sound a judgment : the contrary Doctrin is also of the Reformation, and you may believe it because our glorious Queen Elizabeth dyed a Virgin ; and its credibly reported som few *fellows* of *Oxford* and *Cambridge* liue continently.

Ismael. But what do you think of a Child Christen'd in Popery by a Monk or a Fryar , ought he to be Christen'd again in our Reformation? and what if a Popish Priest or Fryar did becom of our Reformed Church , can he lawfully marry , wheras he made a vow of Chastity ?

Isaac. As to the first *Quere* , its the Doctrin of the Reformation declared by many french Synods and recorded in their Ecclesiastical Discipline , that he must be Christen'd again , because the first baptism was Null : its also the Doctrin of the Reformation declared by the Church of England and many Synods of France , that the first Baptism is sufficient and valid : believe which you please.' It's also the Doctrin of the

Reformation, that Infants baptism is not at all needfull (nay nor Lawfull say the Anabaptists) so saies Calvin Zuinglius, Beza and many others, its likewise the Doctrin of our 39. Articles [b]; and our holy Synod of London [c] that Infants baptism is lawfull and needfull. Believe which you like best; both are of the Reformation.

[a] lib. 4 Inst. c. 15. sect. 20. & 21.
[b] Art. 27.
[c] Can. 29.

As to the second *Quere*, its the Doctrin of the Reformation that Priests and Fryars are obliged to the vow of Chastity which they made in Popery, and cannot marry; this is the Doctrin of many of our Brethren and particularly of [d] Hooker, [e] Marloratus, Budellus and [f] Covel; who say the Papish vows of Pouertie, Obedience and Chastitie are commendable and ought to be kept. You may also believe this is wicked Doctrin, and that they may take wyues notwithstanding their vow of Chastitie, as well as Benefices notwithstanding their vow of Pouertie; believe which you please; both Doctrins are of the Reformation; but the best is to say they can marry.

[d] lib. 2. Eccles. Polit. pag 103.
[e] In Tim. c. 50.
[f] In defens. Hooker. art. 8

for if marriage and benefices were denied them, no Prieſt or Fryar would euer embrace our Reformed Doctrin: We know our great Zuinglius himſelf would not at all preach the Ghoſpell vnto the Suitzers, vntill that he preſented a petition for himſelf and his companions, (all Prieſts and Fryars) extant yet in his 1. Tom. pag. 110. and obtained the contents of it, which was to have Wyves; Nor can wee doubt this to be the beſt Doctrin, wheras Luther, Beza and almoſt all our other Reformers, were Prieſts and Fryars, and the firſt ſtep they gaue in the Reformation was to Marry: the Papiſts and ſom weake Brethren were much ſcandalized at Luthers marriage, and Eraſmus his rallerie vpon it was much ſolemnifed, *Luther yeſterday a Monk, to day a huſband, and next day à Father*, becauſe that honeſt Cate Boren, his virtuous Bride, was hapily delivred of a louey Boy eight daies after he married her: but the Servant of God did not regret the action, which proues that he judged by ſcripture it was very lawfull.

V. DIALOGUE.

ISMAEL. You know I have been born and bred in our holy Reformation, and a Church of England man; you tell me I may believe this or that, and whateuer I pleaſe; I would gladly ſettle once for ever, and reſolve what J may, and ought to believe, and not to be euery day carried away with euery wind of Doctrin: let me, to that purpoſe propoſe vnto you, and hear your reſolution of ſom doubts. What do you think, have not wee a Church on earth eſtablisht by Chriſt, wherin wee are to live and ſerve him, and believe her Doctrin?

Iſaac. J will giue you no other inſtruction nor anſwer but the pure Doctrin of the Reformation; which when you have heard, you may determin as you like beſt, what religion to embrace; but know this, that after you have determin'd with yourſelf to believe this or that; you

may with a very ſafe conſcience alter that reſolution next day after, and believe the quite contrary to what you reſolved to believe, if vpon better conſideration you thinke the contrary to be true; this is the libertie of the holy Reformation as J proued in my firſt Dialogue.

As to your preſent doubt J anſwer, its the Doctrine of the Reformation, that it was Jeſus Chriſt the ſon of God who eſtablisht the Church; you may believe it therefore: It's alſo the Doctrin of the Reformation, that it was not Jeſus Chriſt the ſon of God who eſtablisht the Church: that this is the Doctrin of our Reformation its apparent; for its Scripture as interpreted by Ochinus a man of ſound judgment, *whom all Italy could not match*, ſaies Calvin; *in whoſe preſence England was happy, and vnhappy in his abſence*, ſaies B. Bale: Ochinus ſpeakes thus, [a] *Conſidering how the Church was eſtablisht by Chriſt and washt with his blood; and conſidering again how it was vtterly ouerthrowen by Papacy; I concluded that he who eſtablisht it, could not be Chriſt the ſon*

[a] In Præfat. Dialog.

of God, becanſe he wanted prouidence; and vpon this reflexion he renounced Chriſt and became a Jew: And no man can ſay but that he acted and behaued himſelf like a true Child of the Reformation in ſo doing; for he followed ſcripture as he vnderſtood it; and as he was a true Reformed Child in forſaking Popery, becauſe he vnderſtood by Scripture, that the Reformation was better; ſo ſince he vnderſtood by reading Scripture more, that Judaiſm was better than the Reformation, he acted like a good Reformed, in choſing that which he vnderſtood by Scripture to be the beſt: this is the Reformations Rule of faith: do you, if you pleaſe, as he did, and you'l be as good a Reformed as he.

And if you chooſe to believe that there is a Church eſtablisht on earth by Chriſt, you muſt beware never to believe or perſwade yourſelf that wee are bound to believe her Doctrin, or live in her, if you do not judge by ſcripture that ſhe teachs the Doctrin of Chriſt: This is the moſt eſſential point of Popery; An obli-

gation of ſubmitting our judgments to the Church, and believing her Doctrin without any more examin; and in this the Church of England is much like the Popish Church, which by acts of Parliaments and other ſeverities, would oblige all men to believe her Doctrin Rites and Ceremonies: No, God has given vs ſcripture for our Rule of faith; as wee forſook the Popish Church, becauſe wee diſcouered by Scripture her many Errors in Doctrin; ſo wee are not bound to believe the Doctrin of any other Church, but as wee find by ſcripture her Doctrin is true. Do, and ſpeake as Luther to. 1. Edit. Jen. in Reſolut. *I will be free, and will not ſubmit to the authority of Councils, Popes Church or vniverſity; to the contrary I will confidently teach whatever I judge to be true; whether it be Catholic Doctrin or hereticall; condemned or approued.*

Iſmael. Muſt I not believe that the Doctrin of Jeſus Chriſt, delivered to his Apoſtles and the Church is true Doctrin?

Iſaac. The Reformation teaches

it is, and you may ſafely believe it: You may as ſafely believe it is not, in the Principles of the Reformation; becauſe it teaches that Chriſt err'd in Doctrin and manners: *Vere Phariſæi erant viri valde boni*, ſaies Luther; [b] *& Chriſtus minime debuit eos taxare*: and Calvin ſaies, *its a folly to think he was not ignorant in many things*; laſtly David Georgius [c] (a Man of God and of a holy life ſaies Oſiander) writes. *If the Doctrin of Chriſt and his Apoſtles had been true and perfect; the Church which they planted had continued, but now it is manifeſt that Antichriſt has ſubverted it, as it's manifeſt in Papacy; therefore it was falſe and imperfect.* See theſe words quoted in the hiſtorie of David George printed by the Divins of Baſile, at Antwerp an. 1568. both Doctrins are Scripture as interpreted by men of ſound judgment; a Child of the Reformation, may believe which he will.

b ſerm. de 50. Artic. in ſumma ſummarum.

c In Harm ſuper Luc c. 2:

d Epitom. Cent. 16. par. 2.

Iſmael. Is it not the Doctrin of the Reformation that the Apoſtles were infallible in their Doctrin! much more muſt wee believe that Jeſus Chriſt was ſo.

Isaac. Yes it is; you may believe it: and its also the Doctrin of the Reformation that they were not infallible, neither in their written or vnwritten Doctrin; so, many of our most renowned Drs speake; and whatever any men of sound judgment judge to be true by scripture, is the Doctrin of the Reformation: Zuinglius, [e] one of the greatest Oracles of our Church saies; *It's a great ignorance to believe any infallible authority in the Ghospels or Epistles of the Apostles*; Beza not inferiour to Zuinglius, blotted out of S. John the historie of the woman Adultereſs [f] judging it a fable. Clebitius [g] affirms, *that Luk's relation of Christ's passion is not true, because it does not agree with that of Mathew and Mark, and more credit is to be given to two, than to one.* [h] Calvin saies, *Peter consented to, and added to the schism of the Church, to the ouerthrow of Christian liberty, and Christ's Grace.* [i] Whitaker saies, It's *evident that after the Descent of the Holy G. the whole Church, even the Apostles, erred; and Peter erred in Doctrin and Manners* [k] Luther saies

[e] Tom. 2. cont. Catabapt. fol. 10.

[f] Victoria verit. aug. 5.

[g] In cap. 2. ad Gal.

[h] de Eccles. cont. Bellarm. Cont. 2. q. 4.

[i] To. 5. Wittem.

an 1554. & in Epist. ad Gal. c. 2.

Peter liued and taught extra Verbum Dei; and Brentius [k] his disciple saies, *that Peter and Barnabas, togither with the Church of Ierusalem erred after receiving the H. Ghost.* If our Rule of faith be Scripture as each Person of sound judgment vnderstands it, vndoubtedly this must be the Doctrin of the Reformation, and may be believed by any Reformed, since its Scripture interpreted by such renowned men.

k In Apol. Cōf. c. de Concil.

Ismael. This is most wicked Doctrin, I'l never believe it.

Isaac If you think by Scripture its wicked, do not: follow your Rule of faith, Scripture as you vnderstand it: but if an other vnderstands by scripture (as those authors did) that the Doctrin is good, give him leave to believe it; hee'l but follow his Rule of faith; Scripture as he vnderstands it.

Ismael. I would gladly know which are the true Canonical bookes of scripture.

Isaac. The Reformation teach and you may believe with the Church of England that S. Paul's Epistle to

he Hebrews ; thoſe of James and ude; the 2. of S. Peter ; the 2. and 3 f S. John, are true Cononical Scrip- ure ; the Reformation alſo teachs hey are not Canonical , becauſe utherans deny them ; believe which ou like beſt. But if youl' live in eace , and out of all ſtrife with Pro- eſtants , Lutherans , and others, who diſpute , if this or that be Canonical cripture ; your redieſt and ſpeedi- ſt way will be , to ſay ther's no rue Canonical Scripture ; Scripture no more to be regarded than other ious bookes : if you ſay this is not he Doctrin of the Reformation ; eade Hoſſius *de expreſſo Verbo Dei* , & ib. de Hær. where he relates this to e the Doctrin of the *Swinfeldians* , good Reformeds, as the beſt of vs: they ſay , that wee are not to regard ny inſtruction from man or book , but Gods immediat inſpiration , which ſpeakes ſecretly to our hearts ; for which they alleadge thoſe com- fortable words of the prophet , *I will hear what my Lord my God ſpeakes in me* : for ſay they , the book which we call Scripture , is a creature , and

we muſt not ſeeke for light and inſtruction from any creature, but from God the Father of Lights. This is Scripture as interpreted by men of ſound judgment: any Child of the Reformation may believe it.

Iſmael. I thought to ſettle my mind in my choyce of ſom Religion, and you go the way to beate me from all; for if you renverſ the authority of Scripture, what warrant ſhall wee haue for any Religion? God forbid the Reformation ſhould deny the true Canon, or the infallible truth of Scripture; and let all the world ſay the contrary, I will conſtantly revere and believe it's Gods infallible word.

Iſaac. How can you ſay I beate you from all Religion, when I directly perſwade you to follow the Rule of faith of our Reformation, *Scripture as each Perſon of ſound judgment vnderſtands it*; let this be your Religion, if you will be a true Reformed; Whateuer you judge in your conſcience to be true; let the Church of England, or France or any other ſay and believe what they will; you

re to believe but what you judge by ſcripture to be true, and this is the Religion of the Reformation.

Iſmael. I would gladly know, if it be lawfull to chop or change the text?

Iſaac. It's the Doctrin of the Reformation, that you cannot, becauſe God has forbid to add to, or take away from his word: and therefore wee condemn the Papiſts for their *Traditions*, obtruded vpon the flock as the Word of God: It's alſo the Doctrin of the Reformation, and the practiſe of our beſt Reformers, when the text does not ſpeake cleerly enough, that for to refute Popery and eſtablish our own Doctrin, wee may add or diminish a word or two; which is not to change the Word of God, but to make it ſpeake more expreſly: as when Luther had a mind to preach *Iuſtification by faith alone*; finding the Text ſaid but, *Man is iuſtified by faith*, he added the word *Alone*, and made the Text very cleer against Popery, which formerly was somwhat obſcure: Zuinglius being to teach the *Figurative preſence*

of Christ in the Sacrament, found the Text, *this is my Body*, to be too pat against his Doctrin; and insteed of *Is*, put in, *this signifieth*: The Church of England being to preach the Kings Spiritual Supremacy, could not convince the obstinat Papist by the Original text which saide 1 Pet. 2 *submit yourselves vnto every human creature for the Lord's sake, whether it it be the king as excelling, or to*, &c. But in king Edwards time they altered one word, and made the text thus, *submit yourselves to every Ordinance of man, whether it be to the King as being the cheef head, and the* following impressions of the Bible the yeare 1557. and 79. saie, *To the King as supreame.* And so the true Doctrin is cleerly convinced out of Scripture: as also the Lawfullness of Priests marriage; for the text before the Reformation saide 1. Cor. 9. *have not wee power to leade about a Woman sister*; and now our Bibles say, *have not wee power to leade about a Wife being our sister*: hence its evident according the Doctrine and practise of our Reformation, that when you have a mind to

eſtablish a Doctrin which you judge to be true, you may change the text and make it ſpeake to your ſenſe and meaning, provided you judge your ſenſe to be true.

Iſmael. What do you think of *Iuſtifying faith?* does *faith alone* juſtify vs?

Iſaac. It's the Doctrin of the Reformation, that without charity it cannot, becauſe S. Paul ſaies 1. Cor. 13. *if I have faith ſo as to move mountains, and have no charity, I am nothing*, It's alſo the Doctrin of the Reformation, that its impious and wicked to ſay, *faith alone* without charity does not juſtify; this is Scripture as interpreted by Luther a man of ſound judgment: [l] *Who ſay*, quoth Luther, *that faith alone tho perfect it be cannot, juſtify without charitie; ſay impiouſly and wickedly; becauſe faith alone without any good works doth juſtify.* Believe which Doctrin you pleaſe, both are of the Reformation.

[l] In cap. 2. ad Gal. & ſerm. Angl: pag 204.

Iſmael. Luther was inſolent in checking the Doctrin of S. Paul.

Iſaac. Probably he did not reflect that it was the Doctrin of the

Apostle; and if you will have it to be a check of S. Paul, Luther,[m] will answer for himself *Be it*, saies he, *that the Church, Augustin or other Dr, also Peter and Paul, nay and an Angel from heaven should teach otherwise than as I teach, yet my Doctrin is such that it setteth forth Gods glory; I know I teach no human, but Divin Doctrin.*

[m] In Epist. ad Gal c. 1. & 2. & Tom. 5. Wittemb. an. 1554. fol. 29.

It's the Doctrin of the Reformation that faith alone without any good works, and notwithstanding all sins you are guiltie of, doth justify you: this is Scripture as interpreted by Luther, who saies, nothing can damn you but incredulity, as nothing but faith can save you; of Whitaker, Wotten fulk and Beza whose words I related in our precedent Dialogue; which J believe you remember, and J need not repeat.

Jts also the Doctrin of the Reformation, that good workes are meritorious of grace and glorie;[n] *Hooker* and *Harmonia confess*:[o] say its the Doctrin of scripture; and what any Person of sound judgment judges to be the Doctrin of scripture, he may believe it; for this is our Rule of

[n] lib. 5. de Eccl. Polit. sect. 72.

[o] Pag. 495. & 273.

faith: its likewise the Doctrin generally of all our Church, that good Works are not at all meritorious: Tindal (called by Fox p a Man of God and a constant Martyr) judges this to be so true that in his treatise de *Mammona iniquitatis* he saies, *Christ himself did not by all his good Works merit the glory*: and tho the scripture saies expresly he did; Calvin q affirms, *that its a foolish curiosity to examin, and a rash proposition to say Christ did merit.*

p Acts and Mon. pag. 514.

q lib. 2. Inst. c 17. sect. 6.

Jt's the Doctrin of the Reformation, that tho good works be not meritorious, nor have not the least influence in our *justification* or *salvation*; yet they are absolutly needfull for both; in as much as that true faith cannot be without good Works; because they are the marks and signs of a *living faith*, by which alone wee are saved; this is the judgment of the Church of England expressed in the 11. and 12. Article, of the 39. and of Melancton *in locis Commun. de Bonis operibus*, and you may believe it: You may also believe, and its the Doctrin of the Reformation, that

good Works are so farr from being needfull, that they are prejudicious and hurtfull to our salvation, and the best way to be saved is to do no good Work at all; this is scripture as interpreted by Jlliricus, Flaccius, Amsdorfius quoted in Act. Colloq. Aldeburg. pag. 205. and 299. and Luther [e] was so deeply perswaded of this truth, that tho Christ said, *If thou wilt enter into the Kingdom of heaven, keep the Commandments*: Luther saies, its an obstacle to our Salvation to keep them: *Where it is said*, quoth he, *that faith in Christ doth indeed justify us, but that it is necessary also to keep the Commandements, then Christ is denied, and faith abolisht, because that which is proper to faith alone is attributed to the Commandements.* And again [f] saies he, *if faith be accompanied with good Works, its no true faith; that it may justifie it must be alone without any good Works.* This is Scripture as interpreted by such Eminent and sound men; and consequently the Doctrin of the Reformation; and who doubts but that any Doctrin of the Reformation may be

[e] In Cōment. in cap. 2. ad Gal.

[f] To. 1. Propoſit. 38

believed. Hence forward, when you hear the preacher exhort you to good Works, you may believe him, if you please, and have a mind to spend your monies; because he preaches the Doctrin of the Reformation: or you may laugh at him, and believe not a word he saies, because he preachs against the Doctrin of the Reformation.

Ismael. These are dangerous and scandalous Tenets destructive of piety and Christianity; and let Luther and those Authors you quoted say what they please, the Reformation, nor no honest man will ever believe such abominable Doctrin.

Isaac. I do not say that the Children of the Reformation are obliged to believe them: they may believe as you do, that all are wicked Tenets: but if Luther and the others cited, judge in their conscience these Tenets to be the Doctrin of scripture, and if Peter, John or James like their interpretation; I say they may according the Principles of our Reformation believe them, and be as truly Reformed Children as you:

for our Rule of faith is Scripture as each Person of sound judgment understands it, and in believing those Tenets, because they judge them to be the Doctrin of scripture, they stick fast to, and follow our Rule of faith: why is *Figurative Presence*, and the *kings supremacie* the Doctrin of the Reformation; tho denied by Papists, Lutherans and Presbyterians? but because the Protestants judge its the Doctrin of scripture: if therefore those great Authors I quoted, and any other with them judge those Tenets to be the Doctrin of Scripture, they can be justly called the Doctrin of the Reformation: must Protestants be forced against their judgments to deny Real Presence and supremacy, because Lutherans say its wicked Doctrin? and why must Luther, Illiricus, Flaccius and others be forced to deny those Tenets, tho Protestants or Papists judge them to be damnable! let each one believe what he thinks to be the Doctrin of Scripture, and he will still be a true Reformed Child.

Ismael. Does not our Reformation

teach that it's possible to all men assisted with Gods Grace to keep the Commandments?

Isaac. This is the Doctrin of the Church of England, and consequently of the Reformation: It's also the Doctrin of the Reformation delivered out of Scripture as interpreted by Luther, Calvin, Willet and several others, that its impossible to any man, assisted with what Grace soever to keep the Commandments. *None has ever yet*, saies our great Calvin, [t] *and God has decreed none shall ever keep the Commandments*: Again, [u] *The law and Commandments were given vs, to no other end but that we should be damn'd by them, in as much as that it is impossible for vs to do what they command.* The same Doctrin is taught by Luther in several places of his Works, by Willet, [x] and by our Brethren the Gomarists of Holland, and many of our french Synods. Believe which you please, both Doctrins are of the Reformation.

[t] lib. 2. instit. c. 7. sect. 5.

[u] Harm. Evang. in Luc. c. 10. vers. 26.

[x] In Synop. Papismi pag. 564.

It's also the Doctrin of Luther and Calvin, that God does not cast

men into hell becauſe their ſins deſerve it; nor ſave men becauſe they merit it; but meerly becauſe he will have it ſo: *He crowns thoſe who have not deſerved it* ſaies Luther, *and he punishes thoſe who have not deſerved it: tis Gods wrath and ſeuerity to damn the one, 'tis his Grace and mercy to ſaue the other.* Calvin alſo, *Men are damn'd for no other cauſe but becauſe God will have it ſo; he is the cauſe and author of their damnation; their damnation is decreed by God when they are in their Mother's womb, becauſe he will have it ſo*; this is alſo the belief of our Gomariſts in Holland, of many french Churchs, and of ſeveral learned Calviniſts: tho the Church of England denies this Doctrin, none will dare ſay its not the Doctrin of the Reformation, becauſe its Scripture is interpreted by ſuch Eminent men of our Church.

y lib. de ſervo. Arbit cont. Erasm.

z lib. 3. Inſtit. c. 21. ſect. 5. & 7. & c. 22. ſect. 11. & cap. 23. ſect. 1.

Iſmael. J will neuer believe ſuch execrable Doctrins; nor will J euer be of any Congregation which believes them.

Iſaac. J do not adviſe you to

believe them; but to give others leave to believe them, if they think them to be the Doctrin of Scripture; as Luther, Calvin, Willet, Gomarists and others do: you must not, if you be a true Reformed Child hinder any man from believing, nor be displeased with him for believing what he judges in his conscience to be the Doctrin of Scripture, for this is our Rule of faith: Will not you be of the Congregation and Religion of those, who follow Scripture as their Rule of faith, and Believe what they judge in their conscience to be the Doctrin of Scripture?

Ismael. Yes I will, and am of such a Congregation, for this is the Rule of faith of the Reformation.

Isaac. Why then, you must be of the same Congregation with the Gomarists, Luther, Calvin and the others, who believe those which you call execrable Doctrins, because they follow Scripture as they vnderstand; and believe those Doctrins, because they judge them to be of Scripture: you both follow the same Rule, one goes one way, and the other an

other, and both are of the Reformation. The Church of England vnderſtands by Scripture that God is not the Author nor cauſe of ſin, that he does not force vs to ſin; who doubts but that this is there fore the Doctrin of the Reformation? But Calvin, Brentius, Beza and ſeveral others vndeſtand by Scripture; that God is the cauſe and author which forces our Will to ſin; that man, and the deuil, are but Gods inſtruments to commit it: that murthers, inceſts, blaſphemies, &c are the works of God, that he makes vs commit them: and who doubts but this alſo is the Doctrin of the Reformation being Scripture as interpreted by ſuch eminent and ſound judgments? *God* ſaies Calvin, [a] *directs, moues, inclins and forces the Will of man to ſin; in ſo much that the power and efficacy of working, is wholy in him; man, nay and ſatan when he impells vs, Being only Gods inſtruments which he vſes for to make vs ſin.* Zuinglius, Willet, Beza teach the ſame.

[a] lib. 2. inſt. c. 4 ſec. 3 & l. 1. c. 18 ſect. 2 & l. 3 c. 23 ſec. 4.

Lo. 1 de deprovid. c. 6. in Synopſ. pag. 563. In manifeſt. ſtratag. Papiſt.

VI.

VI. DIALOGUE.

ISMAEL J am weary of hearing such horrid blasphemies; my heart trembles to heare you say, that such abominable Tenets may be believed according our Rule of faith and Principles of our Reformation: I beseech you let me hear no more of such stuff: J conceive very well that mens judgments and consciences are not to be constrain'd to believe or deny this or that Tenet, because the Pope or his *infallible*, forsooth, Church wil have it so;

Isaac. and must they be constrain'd to deny or believe because the *fallible* Church of England or France will have it so?

Ismael. No, J do not say they must, have patience, and heare me speake a whyle: J say that Scripture must be our Rule of faith, and not any Pope, or Church, or Congregation; and that wee are no to be forced by any to believe, but

what wee vnderſtand to be true by Scripture; and that if wee judge by Scripture any Doctrin to be fals and contrary to Gods Word; wee muſt not be forced to believe it: but wee muſt not abuſe this liberty: that wee ſhould have libertie for to believe or deny ſupremacy, figurative Preſence, Communion in one or both kinds, and ſuch other inferior Truths controverted among Chriſtians; and that each Congregation may in ſuch Articles, believe as it vnderſtands by Scripture to be true, may paſs; and its practis'd in our Reformed Churchs: But that wee ſhould run ſo farr, as to have libertie by our Rule of faith to believe or deny the Fundamental and chief Articles of Chriſtianity, as the Trinity, Incarnation, Divinity of Chriſt, &c. that libertie ought not to be giuen: our Reformation very wiſely and piouſly permits the Lutherans to believe one thing, the Preſbyterians an other, the Proteſtants an other, and ſo of the reſt: and all are true Reformed Children, becauſe each of them believes as they judge by Scrip-

ture to be true: but the Reformation has neuer giuen, not neuer will giue liberty to interpret Scripture against the fundamental articles of Christanity: wee must be moderat; and keep our rambling fancies within compass, and if any should judge and interpret Scripture in favor of any scandalous and abominable Tenets against Christianity and good Manners, he must be checkt, and not commended: this moderation the Church of England vses and will never permit the contrary.

Isaac. J percevie a greate deale of Popish blood to run in your veins, and that if you and your Church of England, were in power at the beginning of our Reformation, wee should neuer have had a Luther, Calvin, Beza, or such other noble and renowned Reformers: by what J gather from your discourse, J do not see the breth of an inchs difference betwixt the Church of Rome and you and your Church of England; for the Church of Rome will not stick to grant, that Gods Word alone is her Rule of faith, but so that none must

believe *any ſenſe* of it, but as ſhe believes it, nor interpret *any text*, but receive her interpretation of it: The Church of England has Scripture for her Rule of faith, and gives vs libertie for to interpret, vnderſtand, and believe *ſom texts* of it, as each one thinks beſt; and ſo permits Presbyterians to deny Epiſcopacy, Lutherans to deny Figurative Preſence, &c. and confeſſes they are all her Brethren of the Reformation, but ſhe will give no libertie at all for to interpret *other Texts*, but all muſt vnderſtand them as ſhe does, or *all* muſt be heretiks aud damn'd men: No, that text, *My father and I are one*, muſt be interpreted to ſignifie the Unitie in Nature of the Father and ſon, as the Church of England believes; none muſt interpret it otherwiſe: ſo that the difference betwixt the Popish Church and that of England is; the firſt giues vs no liberty at all: the ſecond giues us ſom libertie; the firſt robs vs of all; the ſecond but of the one half: the Rule of faith in Popery is Scripture as interpreted by the Pope and

Councils; the Rule of faith in England as to *som Articles* is Scripture as interpreted by the Church of England; and as to *other Articles*, Scripture as each Person of sound judgment vnderstands it: and thus Protestants, are but half Papists, and half Reformed, and both these ingredients will never make a good compound.

Let any vnbyas'd and impartial man judge if the Church of England proceeds justly in this: for if our Rule of faith be Scripture as each Person of sound judgment vnderstands it, as she mentions in her 39. Articles; and as the whole Reformation believes, if wee are not to be constraind, to believe any Church, Council, or mans sense of Scripture, if wee do not judge by the Word of God its true; by what authority Rule or reason, can the Church of England give me libertie to vnderstand and believe *som texts* as J please; and deny me libertie for to vnderstand and believe *others*, as J judge by Scripture they ought to be vnderstood? J pray observe well this dif-

course: heer are Luther, Calvin, Beza, Zuinglius and our other first Reformers; they interpret som texts against the Doctrin of Rome, and others against the Doctrin of the Church of England: they are praised for the first, and esteemed Apostolical Reformers, because without any regard of what the Church of Rome said, they freely taught and believed what they judged by Scripture to be true; why must not they be praised and esteemed true Reformers also, for not regarding what the Church of England or any other saies; but teach the impossibility of Gods Commandments, the sufficiency of faith alone, and all those other Tenets which you so much mislike, since they judge by Scripture, that to be the true Doctrin: are they bound to submit their judgments to the Church of England more than to that of Rome?

Ismael. But in those Tenets they do not only contradict the Church of England; but all Christian Churchs and Congregations; for all will say those are wicked and scandalous Doctrin.

Isaac. And if they judge by Scripture that those Tenets are not such, but sound and good Doctrin, may not they believe them, tho all the world and ten worlds did gainsay them? is not Scripture our Rule of faith, and are wee to regard what any Church or all Churchs say, further than wee find by Scripture that they say well? But being these Tenets, which you call horrid blasphemies displease you I'll change my discourse; and because I see you are Popishly inclined, J will shew you how by the Principles of our Reformation, you can be as good a Papist as the Pope; one principle excepted, wherin you must dissent from the Church of Rome, if you intend to remain a true Reformed Child.

Ismael. You promise too much; and more than J desire to know; J don't desire to have any Communication with the Pope; I know by the Writings of our Authors what kind of beast he is.

Isaac. By your favor, you may believe the Popes are worthy, honest, and godly men; many Dis-of-

courſe: heer are Luther, Calvin, Beza, Zuinglius and our other firſt Reformers; they interpret ſom texts againſt the Doctrin of Rome, and others againſt the Doctrin of the Church of England: they are praiſed for the firſt, and eſteemed Apoſtolical Reformers, becauſe without any regard of what the Church of Rome ſaid, they freely taught and believed what they judged by Scripture to be true; why muſt not they be praiſed and eſteemed true Reformers alſo, for not regarding what the Church of England or any other ſaies; but teach the impoſſibility of Gods Commandments, the ſufficiency of faith alone, and all thoſe other Tenets which you ſo much miſlike, ſince they judge by Scripture, that to be the true Doctrin: are they bound to ſubmit their judgments to the Church of England more than to that of Rome?

Ismael. But in thoſe Tenets they do not only contradict the Church of England; but all Chriſtian Churchs and Congregations; for all will ſay thoſe are wicked and ſcandalous Doctrin.

Isaac. And if they judge by Scripture that those Tenets are not such, but sound and good Doctrin, may not they believe them, tho all the world and ten worlds did gainsay them? is not Scripture our Rule of faith, and are wee to regard what any Church or all Churchs say, further than wee find by Scripture that they say well? But being these Tenets, which you call horrid blasphemies displease you I'll change my discourse; and because I see you are Popishly inclined, I will shew you how by the Principles of our Reformation, you can be as good a Papist as the Pope; one principle excepted, wherin you must dissent from the Church of Rome, if you intend to remain a true Reformed Child.

Ismael. You promise too much; and more than I desire to know; I don't desire to have any Communication with the Pope; I know by the Writings of our Authors what kind of beast he is.

Isaac. By your favor, you may believe the Popes are worthy, honest, and godly men; many Di- of

our Reformation, and our Travellers to the Court of Rome give this testimonie of them? you may also believe, that Popes and Cardinals are Knaves and Atheists, who looke on Scripture as a *Romance* and deny the Incarnation of Christ, for Calvin saies so, and would never have said it, if it had not been true: but beware not to speake so in Rome, or they'l lodge you where honest *Taylor* the Quaker was; nor in Spain, or they'l stop your mouth with an Inquisition faggot.

1. 4. Inst. c. 7. sect. 37.

Ismael. I care not what the Pope or Cardinals are; but I would gladly know, what religion and Congregation you are of; for wheras you are my immediat instructor; it behoues me to know what religion you have.

Isaac. As to my Religion, I doubt not but that my Readers will be devided in their judgments of me; if a Papist reades me, hee'l sweare I am an Atheist; but I hope he will not pretend to be infallible as his Pope: if a Protestant, heel say, I am a Papist; and that my drift is to

caſt dirt vpon his Church: the honeſt Quaker will ſay, I am a profane man; others perhaps will ſay I am of no Religion, but a deſpiſer of all; and our Congregations are ſo vncharitable that likely none will accept of me, becauſe I ſay all religions are very good: a ſad thing that a man muſt be hated for ſpeaking well of his neighbours; and that each one muſt have all the world to be naught but himſelf: this then is my Religion, To ſuffer perſecution for juſtice and truth; to render good for evil; to bleſs thoſe who curſe me; and ſpeake well of all congregations, whylſt they ſpeake all evil againſt me: reflect well vpon what I diſcourſed hitherto, and you will find, I am as great a louer of the Reformation as they who may think me its enemie; and reade my following diſcourſe and you will find I loue Popery as well as the Reformation: the Spirit of God makes no exception of Perſons.

Iſmael. You promiſed to proue by the Principles of the Reformation, that wee may believe all the Tenets

of Popery, and remain ſtill of the Reformation: how can this be?

Iſaac. You remember I excepted one Principle of Poperie, wherin you muſt neceſſarily diſſent from them: and if you deny this one Principle, you may believe all their others Tenets as well as the Pope; and be as good a Child of the Reformation as Luther.

Iſmael. What Principle is this, which you ſeem to make the only diſtinctive ſign of a Reformed, from a Papiſt.

Iſaac. Liſten a whyle: a Papiſt is not a Papiſt becauſe he believes Purgatory, Tranſubſtantiation, Indulgences, and the reſt of Popish Tenets, but becauſe he believes them vpon the teſtimonie of the Pope and Church, becauſe they aſſure him they are revealed Truths: if a Papiſt did ſay, I believe theſe Tenets becauſe I myſelf do judge by ſcripture that they are revealed; and not, becauſe the Pope and Church ſay they are; he would be no Papiſt: The Papiſt believes the Myſtery of the Trinity, the Incarnation and paſſion of Chriſt:

the Protestant believes the same Mysteries; yet the one is a Papist and no Protestant; the other is a Protestant and no Papist. And why? because the Papist believes them vpon the testimonie of the Pope and Church, the Protestant believes them vpon the testimony of Gods Written Word: believe then whatever you please of Popery, provided you believe it, because you judge by Scripture its true, and not because the Pope or the Church sayes it; you'l never be a Papist but a perfect Reformed.

Ismael. If this discourse be solid, you may hedge in all the Articles of Popery into our Reformation.

Isaac. If you peruse the works of our Reformed Drs you'l hardly find any Article of Popery, but has been judged by many, or som of our best Reformed Drs, to be the true Doctrin of scripture; and wheras any Doctrin which any Person of sound judgment vnderstands by scripture to be true may be justly called the Doctrin of the Reformation; it follows that hardly is there any Article of Popery, for which wee see so many persecutions

againſts ſubjects, and ſuch troubles in our Parliaments, but is truly the Doctrin of the Reformation.

Iſmael. Shew me ſom examples of this.

Iſaac. The Veneration of Relicks and Saints dead bones, is generally believed by vs to be meer Popery and ſuperſtition; therefore wee made no ſtore of Luther and Calvins bones, tho wee know them to be as great Saints as any in the Popish Church: but Veneration of Relicks and Saints bones, is the Doctrin of our Reformation; for whatever is ſet down and commended by our Common Prayer book, muſt be vndoubtedly eſteemed our Reformed Doctrin and practice, and our common Prayer book printed ſince our Kings happy reſtauration, in its Kalender ſets down a day to the Tranſlation of S. Edward king of Saxons Body in the month of June; and dedicats an other to the tranſlation of the Bodies of S. Martin and Swithin, in the month of July.

The Veneration and vſe of the Sign of the Croſs, is flat Popery in the

the judgment of all our Congregations; yet any Reformed Child may laudably and piously vse it; wheras our Common Prayer Book in *the Administration of Baptism*, commands the Minister to vse it, saying, *Wee sign him with the sign of the Croß, in token that heerafter he shall not be ashamed, to confeß the faith of Christ crucified, and manfully to fight vnder his banner against Sin, the world and the Deuil.* And in our Kalender printed since his Majesti's restauration, its called the Holy Croß.

Our Congregations generally believe, its Popery to keep Holy daies (except the Sabboth day) and Saints daies; to fast Lent, Vigils, commanded, Emberdays, and fridaies; and all this is recommanded to vs in our Common Prayer book, and the Minister is commanded, in the *Administration of the Lords Supper*, to publish the Holy daies of the week, and exhort vs to fast; and surely, he is not commanded to teach, or exhort vs to any thing, but to the Doctrin of the Reformation: It's true the Students of our Colledges of

Oxford and Cambridge ; are much troubled with ſcruples in this point: theſe *Pauperes de Lugduno*, are compelled to faſt all fridays throughout the yeare ; and its not hungar that makes them complain, but tenderneſs of Conſcience, becauſe they feare its Popery.

It's a Popish error, wee ſay, to believe that *Pennance*, or our penal works of faſting, almſdeeds, or corporal auſterities, can auaile and helpe for the remiſſion of our Sins, and ſatisfying Gods Juſtice : No, we ſay, penal works, ſerue for noting ; all is don by *Repentance* ; that's to ſay, by ſorrow of heart for having offended God. This is the Doctrin of Danæus, Willet, Junius and Calvin, who ſaies *Francis*, *Dominick*, *Bernard*, *Antony*, and the reſt of Popish Monks and Fryars, are in hell for their auſterities and penal Works: for all that, you may very well believe, and its the Doctrin of the Reformation, that *Pennance* and Penal Works, do auaile for the remiſſion of our ſins, and are very profitable to the ſoule ; for, our Common Prayer

booke in the *Commination against sinners*, saies thus; *In the Primitive Church, there was a godly Disciplin, that at the beginning of Lent, such as were notorious Sinners, were put to open pennance, and punisht in this world, that their soules may be saued in the day of the Lord.* And our Common Prayer booke wishes, that this Disciplin were restored again; and Surely, it does not wish that Popery were restored; therefore its no Popery to say, that Pennance or penal Works, do satisfy for our sins in this world, and auaile to save vs in the other.

Ismael. I know, many of our Congregations, mislike much our Common Prayer booke for these Popish Tenets; but what do you say of the grand errors of Popery, can a man be a true Child of the Reformation, and yet believe the *Popes Supremacy*; deny the *Kings supremacy*; believe *Transubstantiation* and *Communion in one kind*; are these Tenets, the Doctrin of the Reformation, or consistent with its Principles?

Isaac. The kings supremacy is

vndoubtedly the Doctrin of the Reformation; becauſe its judged by the Church of England to be of Scripture: yet not only the Quakers, Presbyterians, Anabaptiſts, and other Congregations, judge its not of Scripture, but as erroneus a Tenet, as that of the Popes ſupremacy; Calvin 6. Amos, ſaies; *They were vnaduiſed people and blaſphemers, who raiſed king Henry the VIII. ſo far as to call him the head of the Church*; but alſo that no Civil Magiſtrat can be the head of any particular Church, is the Doctrin of the *Centuriators* cent. ſept. pag. 11. of Cartwright, Vrietus, Kemnitius and many others; who doubts then but that in the Principles and Doctrin of the Reformation, you may deny the Kings Supremacy, tho the Church of England believes it. The Popes Supremacy is the Doctrin of Popery; who doubts it? but its alſo the Doctrin of the Reformation, for many of our Eminent Drs. haue judged it to be the Doctrin of Scripture; as Whitgift, [a] who cites Calvin, and Muſculus for this opinion: but its needfull wee relate

[a] In Defenſ. &c. pag. 373. 70. and 395.

ſom of their expreſs words, *I do nōt deny* ſaies Luther, [b] *but that the Bishop of Rome, is, has been, and ought to be the firſt of all; I believe, he is aboue all other Bishops, its not lawfull to deny his ſupremacy*: Melancton [c] ſaies no leſs *that the B. of Rome is aboue all the Church; that it is his Office to govern, to judge in controverſies, to watch ouer the Prieſts, to keep all Nations in conformity and vnity of Doctrin*: Somaiſius, [d] *The Pope of Rome has been without controverſie the firſt Metropolitan in Italie, and not only in Italie, nor only in the Weſt, but in all the world, the other Metropolitans have bin chief in their reſpective diſtricts, but the pope of Rome has bin Metropolitan and Primat, not only of ſom particular Dioces, but of all.* Grotius [e] has expreſly the ſame Doctrin and proves this ſupremacy belongs to the Pope de *Iure Divino*. I pray conſider if theſe Drs. be not men of ſound judgment, and of eminent learning and credit in our Reformation, and if our Doctrin be Scripture as ſuch men vnderſtand it, conſider I ſay with what juſtice can this Doctrin be called Popery more

[b] In Reſponſ. tredecem Propoſ.

[c] in Epiſt. ad Card. Belay Epiſc. Parienſ.

[d] In Tract. Euchar. ad P. Sermondum

[e] In Annot. ſuper Novum Teſtam. cap 10. Matth. & ſæpe alibi.

than Reformed Doctrin.

As for Transubstantiation, it contains two difficulties; first if the Body of Christ be really in the Sacrament; and this Real presence, the Lutherans defend to be the Doctrin of Scripture, as well as the Papists; why then should it be called Popish, more than Reformed Doctrin? the second is, if the substance of bread, be in the Sacrament togither with Christs Body: Lutherans say it is; Papists say it is not, but that there is a Transubstantiation, or change of the whole substance of bread, into the Body of Christ; but hear what Luther [f] saies of this that wee call Popish Doctrin? *I give all Persons libertie to believe in this point, what they please, without hazard of their salvation, either that the bread is in the Sacrament of the Altar, or that it is not.* Would Luther have given this liberty, if Transubstantiation had not been the Doctrin of the Reformation as well as any other? Calvin [g] also and Beza [h] affirm, that Luther's Doctrin of the coexistence of Christ's Body and the bread, is more absurd, than the Popish

[f] To. 1. Edit. Ienen. l. de Capt. Babyl.

[g] Admonit. 2. ad Westph. defens. 2. Orthod. fid.

[h] Lib. de Cœna Domini.

Doctrin of the existence of the Body alone; if therefore wee be true Reformed, and safely believe the Doctrin of Luther, which is the most absurd; much more will we be of the Reformation, by believing that of the Papists, which is less.

Communion in One kind, is the Doctrin of the Reformation, no less than Communion in both: for besides that Luther saies, [i] *They sin not against Christ, who vse one kind onely, seeing Christ has not commanded to vse both*; and again, [k] *tho it were an excellent thing to vse both kinds in the Sacrament; and Christ has commanded nothing in this, as necessary, yet it were better to follow peace and Vnity, than to contest about the kinds*; but also Melancton; [l] who in the opinion of Luther surpasses all the Fathers of the Church; expressly teachs the same Doctrin: and the Church of England Statut 1. Edward VI. commands, *That the Sacrament be commonly administer'd in both kinds, if necessitie does not require otherwise*; mark, he saies but *Commonly*; and that for som necessity it may be receved in *one*; lastly the

i lib. de capt. Babyl. c. de Euchar.

k Epist ad Bohemos in declarat. Euch. & in serm. de Euch.

l in Concil. Theol. ad March. Elect. de vsu vtriusque speciei pag. 141.

ſufficiency of one kind in the Sacrament, is plainly ſet down by our Reformed Church of France in her Eccleſiaſtical Diſciplin printed at *Saumur*, chap. 12. art. 7. *The Miniſter muſt give the bread in the ſupper to them, who cannot drink the Cup, provided it be not for contempt.* And the reaſon is, becauſe there are many who cannot endure the taſt of Wine: wherefore it often happens among them, that ſom perſons, do take the bread alone: and truly if ſom of our Miniſters in England, do not give better wine than they are acuſtomed, who very irreverently ſerve that holy Table with naughtie trash; its much to be feared, that our flock will alſo petition to be diſpenſ'd with in the Cup; becauſe there are ſom of ſo delicat Palats, that they cannot endure the taſt of bad Wine. Now, you may admire the injuſtice of the Papiſts in condemning our Reformed Doctrin and Doctors as Hereticks, whereas thoſe Tenets are believed by many of vs, as well as by them; and the groundleſs ſeverity of our Congregations in exclaiming againſt that Doc-

rin; it being the Doctrin of the Reformation, wheras so many eminent men of our own, judge it to be of Scripture.

Ismael. Wheras I see people persecuted by the Church of England for these Tenets, I can hardly be perswaded they are the Doctrin of the Reformation: at our next meeting wee will pursue this discourse; the Bell rings for morning Prayers; A Dieu.

VII. DIALOGUE.

ISAAC. You come from Church, as I guess by the Common Prayer booke I see in your hands, I pray let me see the Kalender of it; if it be *à la mode nouvelle*, which was made by the Church of England, since his Majesties restauration.

Ismael. Why? have you met any thing in it, which shocks you?

Isaac. Shock me? No Doctrin or practice of any Congregation, or man of sound judgment of our Church

can ſhock me; you know, I pleade for libertie to believe and practiſe as each one judges by ſcripture to be true and good. But I obſerve in your Kalender, you have a day conſecrated to *S. Ann* in the month of of July; I would gladly know, what *Ann* is this, which the Church of England honors ſo much?

Iſmael. It's *Ann*, the Mother of the Virgin Mary.

Iſaac. Is't poſſible? J thought it was *Ann Bolen* the mother of our Virgen Elizabeth: J am ſure the Church of England, is more obliged to her, than to the other: but as you have put heer the Mother of the Virgin Mary, why did not you put in alſo Elizabeth mother of the great Baptiſt; and the Angel Gabriel, as well as Michael?

Iſmael. J know not indeed.

Iſaac. Nor do J know, if it be not, becauſe that Elizabeth and Gabriel made the Popish *Ave Maria*, as Scripture relates; but can you tell, as the Church of England put in your Kalender, S. George, S. Andrew and S. David, Patrons of England,

Scotland and Wales; why did not she put in S. Patrick Patron of Ireland?

Ismael. J can't tell; what may be the reason, think you?

Isaac. J know not, if it be not that he forfeited his place for his Purgatorie; for tho the others were as deep in Popery as he,) if wee believe the Papists;) but the Parliament pass'd an Act of Indemnity for England, Scotland and Wales after the kings return to his kingdoms; and thereby the sin of Popery was forgiven to their Patrons; and no act of Indemnitie was past for Jreland, whereby Patrik is still guiltie; if it be not, that the *Seaven Champions of Christendom* tell us S. Patrick was S. Geotge his footman, and it was not thought good manners, to put him in the same rank with his Master.

Ismael. For shame, if not for piety, forbeare, J cannot endure to sully sacred things with profane Raleries; the Kalender is a holy institution of the Church, and ought to be reverenc'd.

Isaac. And so is Episcopacy, surplices, Bells, Organs, and Corner

Capps ; yet J hope you will give Presbyterians, Anabaptists, Quakers, &c. leave to laugh at them: and be still as good Children of the Reformation as you : if you esteem them to be sacred and holy, reverence and honor them ; J commend you for it ; if others judge otherwise let them follow their humor ; *each one as he fancies, saies the fellow kissing his Cow* ; this is the holy Libertie of the Reformation, Scripture as each one vnderstands it.

Ismael. Let vs return to our last discourse ; how is it possible, that those Tenets of Popery, should be the Doctrin of the Reformation, wheras wee see the Church of England so severely persecut the Professors of them?

Isaac. Do you think a Doctrin is not of the Reformation, because its denied by the Church of England? or because she persecutes the Professors of it? do not they persecute all *non Conformists*, as well as Popery? persecution is no proof of a Doctrin to be bad ; it's but the effect of a blind zeale armed with power : for

to

to know certainly if a Doctrin, be of the Reformation, you must tryé it by our test or Rule of faith, which is the Written Word of God; and whateuer any man of sound judgment, of a sincere and humble heart judges to be contained in Scripture, or an indubitable consequence out of it; that man, may believe that Doctrin, let all others judge of it as they list; and by so believing will be a true Child of the Reformation; wherefore, since that the Church of France, that of England in Edward the VI. time, Luther, Melancton, Grotius, and the other authors I quoted, do judge Transubstantiation, Popes Supremacy, and Communion in one kind to be the Doctrine of Sctipture: wee must call it the Doctrin of the Reformation; and if you judge as they did, you may believe that Doctrin, and be still of the Reformation, as well as they.

Ismael. Can you shew me any other Tenet of Popery, which you can call the Doctrin of the Reformation.

Isaac. Alas! you can hardly shew

mé any Tenet of Popery, but what is its Doctrin; what Doctrin more Popish than that of Confession and Absolution from sins? yet its as truly the Doctrin of the Reformation, as Figurative Presence: for not only [a] Lobechius, [b] Altamerus, [c] Sarcerius and [d] Melancton say, its a Sacrament: but the Church of England in our Common Prayer booke, declares that Priests have not only the power of declaring their sins to be forgiuen to the Penitents, but also the power of forgiuing them: and sets down the form of Absolution, which the Minister is to vse; *Our Lord Iesus Christ, who left power to the Church, to absolve all sinners which truly repent, of his mercie forgive thee and thine offences; and I by his authoritie committed vnto me, do Absolvie thee from all they sins:* the ministers of the Dioceſs of Lincoln in their *Survey of the book of Common Prayers*, checkt this Doctrin as Popery, and petitioned to have it blotted out; but could not prevaile; whereby we are given to vnderstand, its the Doctrin of the Reformation.

[a] In Disput. Theol. pag. 301.
[b] in Conciliat. loc. Scrip. loco. 191.
[c] In locis Cõmun. To. 1. de Potest. Eccl.
[d] in Apol. Confes. Aug. art 13. & l. b. 1. Epist. pag. 234.

It's Popery, wee say, to call Extream Vnction, Confirmation, and Holy Order of Priesthood, Sacraments: and who can justly denie all this to be the Doctrin of the Reformation? for Calvin [e] saies, *I confess, the Disciples of Christ did vse Extream Vnction as a Sacrement; I am not, saies he, of the opinion of those, who judge it was only a Medecin for corporal diseases*: Calvin [f] also, and with him our Common Prayer book and all our Divins say, a Sacrament is nothing els, but a Visible sign of the invisible Grace wee receive by it; and they say with [g] Couel, [h] Hooker and others that this definition fits exactly Confirmation; wherfore the Ministers of the Dioceſs of Lincolne, check the Common Prayer book, for giving the Difinition of a Sacrament to Confirmation. [i] Melancton, [k] Bilson [l], Hooker and [m] Calvin expresly teach, that the Order of Priesthood, is a Sacramēt. And when men of so eminēt judgment of our Reformation teach, this to be the Doctrin of Scripture, who doubts but that it is of the Reformation.

[e] In cap. 5. Epist. Iac. v. 4.

[f] lib. 4. Inst. c. 14. sect. 5.

[g] In modest. Examin.

[h] in Eccl. Polit. l. 5. sect. 66.

[i] In locis Cōmun. tit. de Numero Sacram.

[k] in perpet. Regim. pag. 109.

[l] In Eccl. Polit. lib. 5. sect. 77.

[m] lib. 4. Inst. c. 29.

Ismael. By this, you destroy the Doctrin of the Reformation, of two Sacraments only.

Isaac. Destroy it? God forbid: Because the Church of England saies, there are but two Sacraments, I say its the Doctrin of the Reformation, there are but two: and because so many eminent men judge by Scripture there are more, I say its the Doctrin of the Reformation there are more, that's to say six, Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Pennance, Extrem Unction and Holy Order: ande very likely our Bishops and Ministers, for their Wyves sake, will not stick to grant that Matrimony also is a Sacrament.

Ismael. But can you say, that Prayers to Saints and Images, Prayers for the dead, and Purgatorie, are not meer Popery, and in no wise the Doctrin of the Reformation?

Isaac. Without doubt, those Tenets are Popery; but all the world knows, the Lutherans vse Images in their Churchs and pray before them; and the holy synod of Charenton has declared, as wee said in our first Dia-

logue, that the Lutherans have nothing of Superstition or Idolatry in their manner of Divin Worship; this is also the Doctrin [n] of Jacobus Andreas, [o] Brachmanus, [p] Kemnitius, Luther and Brentius quoted by Beza [q] and why should not a Doctrin judged by such eminent men to be of Scripture, be called the Doctrin of the Reformation? Prayers for the dead and Purgatorie, is Popery confessedly; but alas, it is taught expresly by Urbanus, Regius [r] Bucer, [s] Zuinglius, [t] Melancton, [u] Luther, [x] the Common Prayer book in king Edwards time printed 1549. and many others of our learned Drs, and what can you call more properly the Doctrin of the Reformation, than what such men teach to be the Doctrin of scripture: And tho our Brethren, Quakers, Anabaptists, Presbyterians and Protestants judge Prayers to Angels and Saints to be nothing else but Popery: yet our Common Prayer booke has the same Collect or Prayer to Angels in S. Michael's day, that the Popish Mass Book has, and desires that the An-

[n] Epist. Colloq. Montisbel.
[o] In Centur. Exercit. Theol. pag. 270.
[p] Exam. par. 4.
[q] in respons. ad acta Colloq Montisbelgar. par. 2. in Præfat.
[r] In loc. cõmun c. 18. & 19.
[s] in script. Angl. pag. 450.
[t] To. 1. in Explan. Art. 30. & Art. 60.
[u] in Apolog. Confes. Aug.
[x] To. 1. Wittem. in resol. de Indul. concl. 15.

gels *may succour and defend vs on earth*: and prayers to, and intercession of Saints is taught by Luther, ? Bilneus and Latimer quoted by Fox, and consequently its the Doctrin of the Reformation.

? Epist ad Spalat. ? Acts and mon. pag. 462. & 1312.

Ismael. If all these Popish Articles, may be safely believed by the Reformation, and be the Doctrin of our Reformed Church, as well as of Popery; what difference then betwixt vs and Popery: or why are we called a Reformation of Popery, or why did wee separat from them?

Isaac I have told you already, that our difference from Popery, is not, because wee must deny what they believe, for wee believe as well as they the Unity and Trinity of God, the Incarnation of his son, &c. but in this, that the Papists believe because the Pope and Church saies this is true revealed Doctrin: but wee believe not because any Church, Pope or Doctor saies so, but because wee ourselves judge by scripture it is so: for if a Papist did say, *I do not believe this is a revealed Truth, because the Pope and Church saies it is*,

but becauſe I find by ſcripture it is; he would be no Papiſt: believe then whatever Doctrin you will, either Popery, Iudaiſm, Proteſtancy, Arianiſm or what elſe you pleaſe, provided you judge by ſcripture it is true, and that you believe it, not becauſe this or that Church, Congregation, or Drs believe it, but becauſe yourſelf judges it to be true; you'l be a true Child of the Reformation: And this is the reaſon why wee are called a Reformation, and why wee ſeparated from them, becauſe they would haue vs take for our Rule of faith Scripture as interpreted by them; and believe, not what wee judge to be the Doctrin of Scripture, but what they judge; and this is alſo the Reaſon why Pteſbyterians are jealous with the Church of England; why Anabaptiſts forſake Preſbyterians, why theſe are forſaken by Quakers, becauſe each one would haue the world judge as they do, and perſecute and trouble one another, which is quite againſt the Spirit of the Reformation, for wher as our Rule of faith is no Church,

Congregation or man, but Scripture as each one vnderſtands it; it follows that by our Principles, every one muſt be permitted to believe whatever he pleaſes; and by ſo doing, he will be a true Child of the Reformation.

Iſmael. The Church of England nor any of our Congregations, will neuer believe any of thoſe Popish Tenets.

Iſaac. The time may come, that they may believe them all, and be ſtill as good Reformeds as now they are: for if the Pope and his Church ſhould to morrow deny and excommunicat thoſe Tenets, which now they ſo ſtedfaſtly believe (and I hope they will ſom day) then it would be a pious and virtuous action in all Reformed Children, to believe them all, as much as now they deny them: and let vs pretend what other reaſons wee pleaſe: but its very certain that the ſtrongeſt reaſon wee can haue to deny thoſe Articles, is becauſe the Pope and his Church believes them, and conſequently, if the Popish Church, would but deny them, wee might and ought to believe them:

you will think this a Paradox; but listen to our Apostolical and Divin Luther: [a] *If a general Council, saies he, did permit Priests to marry; it would be a singular mark of piety and sign of Godlyness in that case to take Concubins, rather than to marry in conformity to the Decree of the Council, I would in that case command Priests not to marry under pain of damnation.* And again saies he; [b] *if the Council should decree Communion in both kinds; in contempt of the Council, I would take one only kind or none.* See these words of Luther quoted by our learned Hospinian [c] and Jewel [d] and see its not only my Doctrin but of great Luther, that in case the Pope and Council deny all the Tenets, they now believe; wee may, and it will be a pious godly action to believe them, and make as many Acts of Parliament for them, as now wee have against them. But what's the matter? me thinks you become pale som thing troubles you, speake, what ist?

[a] To. 2. Germ. fol. 214.

[b] de formula miss. & To. 3. Germ.

[c] in histor. Sacram. par. 2. fol. 13.

[d] In replica cõt. Hardingum.

Ismael. It's the horror J conceive against your discourse, my counte-

tenance cannot be in a calm; when my mind is in such a storm and confusion; pursue no more: you said enough, that I should curse the day I haue euer seen you, or heard that, which you call *Holy Liberty*, which is but a prostitution of Consciences, a profanation of all that is sacred, and an open gap to all impiety in Doctrin and manners: but I hope the Lord has giuen me that profound respect and attache to our holy Reformation, that I shall not be beatten from it by all your engines, able to inspire a contempt and hatred of it to any weake Brother: for who would liue a moment in it: if such impious Tenets, such sandalous and blasphemous Doctrins were of it, or were vnauoidable sequeles out of its principles: No, No, the Principles of the Reformed Church, are sound and Orthodox, and no Doctrin can follow from them, but what's pure and true.

Isaac. Let me tell you, I have as tender a loue for the Reformation, as you: and I will maintain the holy Libertie I assert, cannot justly be

called a proſtitution of Conſciences; for, you dare not deny but this is an Orthodox and ſound Principle, that our Rule of faith is Scripture as each Perſon of ſound judgement vnderſtands it; that it is lawfull for each perſon of ſound judgment to reade it. to giue his judgement of the true ſenſe of it, and to believe and hold that ſenſe of it, which he thinks in his Conſcience to be true; is there any proſtitution of Conſciences in this Doctrin? or is it not the Doctrin of our Reformation?

Iſmael. All this in true, the proſtitution of conſciences leyes not there; but in the ſcandalous and blaſphemous Tenets, which you pretend that follow out of that Rule of faith.

Iſaac. But you wrong the Reformation in calling ſuch Tenets blaſphemies and ſcandals: for ſince our Rule of faith is Scripture as each Perſon of ſoud judgment vnderſtands it; if this Rule of faith be good and ſound; if it be religious and holy; any Doctrin that is conformable to this Rule, muſt be good,

ſound, religious and holy; this being our Rule of faith and manners, it cleerer than day light, that all and each Tenet which J rehearſed in all my former diſcourſes, are conformable to our Rule of faith; for our Rule is, *Scripture as each man of ſound judgment vnderſtands it.* our Doctrin therefore muſt be, *what any Perſon of ſound judgment vnderſtands to be the Doctrin of Scripture.* This is an evident ſequele out of that Principle, and wheras there is not one Tenet of all thoſe which J rehearſed, whether they concern Doctrin or Manners; but was judged by the Doctors, which J cited for it, to be the Doctrin of Scripture; it follows vnauoiably, that there is not one Tenet of them, but is the Doctrin of the Reformation: therefore you muſt be forced to either of theſe two; either to ſay that our Rule of faith, by which ſuch Doctrins are warranted, is naught, wicked and ſcandalous, and leads to a proſtitution of conſciences and Manners; or that all thoſe Tenets, are good, ſound, pious, and no proſtitution or corruption

ruption of our conſciences: for, pick and chooſe out the Doctrin which you think to be the moſt wicked and ſcandalous of all thoſe J rehearſed; you cannot deny, but that it was taught by the author J quoted for it, and judged by him, to be the Doctrin of Scripture: and if no Doctor hitherto had believed it, you or J, or ſom other perſon of ſound judgment, may judge it to be the Doctrin of Scripture: either of both then, you muſt be conſtrained to grant: or that the Doctrin of the Reformation, is not what each Perſon of ſound judgment vnderſtands to be the Doctrin and ſenſe of Scripture, which is as much as to ſay, that our Rule of faith muſt not be Scripture as wee vnderſtand it, but that wee muſt believe againſt our own judgment and conſcience, what others ſay is the Doctrin and ſence of Scripture: or you muſt grant that all and each of thoſe Tenets J rehearſed, is the Doctrin of the Reformation, tho you, or this, or that man may judge them to be blaſphemies and ſcandals.

Iſmael. J confeſs our Rule of faith

in the Reformation is Scripture as each Perſon vnderſtands it; for all our Reformed Churchs, with the Church of England inher 39. Articles do giue vs this Rule of faith: I confeſs conſequently out of this Principle, that wee muſt not believe what Doctrin or ſenſe of Scripture others judge to be true and orthodox, if wee do not ourſelues judge it to be ſuch, for wee muſt not be forced to believe againſt our judgments: laſtly I confeſs wee may ſafely believe, whatſoeuer Doctrin wee ſeriouſly judge to be Doctrin of Scripture, but prouided, that ſuch a Tenet or Doctrin be not plainly againſt Scripture, and be not plain and downright impiety and blaſphemie.

Iſaac. And in caſe you, or the Church of England, Rome, France, or Germany judges a Doctrin to be blaſphemous and againſt Scripture, and Luther, or Calvin or J, or an other, judges it is good Doctrin and conformable to Scripture; to which judgment muſt J ſtand? muſt J believe yours againſt my Conſcience

and knowledge: or must not I believe my own? is it not the Principle and practice of our Reformation, that I must believe what I judge in my conscience to be Scripture, and not what others judge, if they judge the contrarie? when Luther began the Reformation, did not almost all Christians, and the whole Church believe Purgatorie and Prayers to saints to be the Doctrin of Scripture; and did not he, very commendably, deny it against them all, because he judged by Scripture it was not? will a Presbyterian believe Episcopacy because the Church of England saies its the Doctrin of Scripture; no, but deny it because himself judges it is not.

Ismael. Its true, each one may lawfully believe what himself judges to be the Doctrin of Scripture; provided he be a godly wel intentioned man, humble and meeke in Spirit; provided secondly, that what he vnderstands to be the sense and Doctrin of Scripture, be not absurd and impious in the judgment of all the rest of the faithfull: for, let a man

be euer ſe learned and godly, if he gives an interpretation of Scripture, which is denied by all the Church, he muſt not be followed

Iſaac. Your firſt *Prouiſo* is very good, and J hope you will meet no Doctor of all thoſe J quoted for thoſe Tenets, which you call blaſphemies, who was not a learned, godly humble and well intentioned man, who will be ſo bold as to deny it of Luther, Calvin, Beza, Zuinglius, &c. Your ſecond *Proviſo* is not juſt, and in it you ouerthrow the whole Reformation, and our Rule of faith; for this being, as you granted, Scripture as each Perſon of ſound judgment vndeſtands it; whateuer interpretation or ſenſe any man of ſound judgment vnderſtands to be of Scripture, he may ſafely and piouſly believe it, tho all the reſt of the world ſhould judge it to be impious and blaſphemous; otherwiſe our Rule of faith, muſt not be Scripture as wee vnderſtand it; but as it is vnderſtood by others: and wheras no Tenet, of all thoſe J rehearſed, but was judged to be the ſenſe and Doctrin

of Scripture by som of thoſe eminent Drs. I quoted; it follows, they might have ſafely believed them; and if you or J judge as they did, wee may alſo believe as they did, and be ſtill of the Reformation.

Iſmael. It's wicked and pernicious to ſay, any particular Perſon may believe his own privat ſenſe and interpretation of Scripture, if it be judged by all others to be naught; and therefore the Church of England, prudently and wiſely, puts a ſtop and bridle to the extravagant and rambling imaginations of particular Perſons; they muſt conform themſelves, and believe but what the Church judges may be ſafely believed.

Iſaac. Pray Sr., ſince when is it cõmendable to conſtrain mens judgments to believe, not what each one thinks beſt, but what the Church thinks may be ſafely believed? was this commendable in the beginning of our Reformation, when our bleſſed Reformers began to teach their privat judgments againſt the Church then eſtablisht? if it was; then the

Church of Rome is to be commended, for perſecuting and excommunicating our firſt Reformers; and if this was not, nor is not commendable in the Church of Rome; why is it commendable in the Church of England? this is a peece of Popery, wherof the Church of England is guiltie, and for which all our Congregations are iealous of her: be it knowen to you, our other Congregations, Lutherans, Calviniſts, Anabaptiſts, &c. are as truly and godly Children of the Reformation as the Church of England; and they will not ſubmit to that Popish tyranny, nor ſuffer any curb to their judgments, but will have our Rule of faith to be but Scripture, and each one to vnderſtand, and believe it, as he thinks beſt in the Lord.

Iſmael. I confeſs, other Congregations will admit no ſuch curb, nor bridle to their judgments, but follow Scripture as they vnderſtand it; but the Church of England has a reverent regard for the ſenſe and interpretation of it given by the Primitive ages, Fathers and Councils;

and that wee prefer before the privat interpretations of particular Persons.

Isaac. And just so saied the Popish Church to Luther and our first blessed Reformers; and if that had been well don; wee should have had, neither Protestancy, nor any other Reformation: but you confess at least, that the Rule of faith in all other Congregations, is but Scripture as each Person vnderstands it, and each person may consequently believe his own sense of it, and deny the sense of any other if he does not like it: then you must confess, that in all other Congregations, except the Church of England, any Reformed Child may believe any sense and Doctrin, which any Person of sound judgment judges to be Scripture, if himself likes it, tho all the rest of the world may think it naught; and wheras you cannot deny, but that all and each Dr. quoted by me for those Tenets, which you call blasphemies, were sound and able judgments; you must confess, that it is a necessarie sequele out of their Rule of faith, that in

all other Congregations they may piouſly and ſafely believe all thoſe Tenets, and be ſtill true Children of the Reformation.

Iſmael. J confeſs if they ſpeake coherently and ſtand to their Principles, they may believe them ſafely; but as J hate thoſe blaſphemous Tenets, I abhorr and deteſt alſo that Principle and Rule of faith of other Congregations, from which ſuch Tenets are vnavoidable ſequeles.

Iſaac. Good Iſmael; you forget what you have hitherto all along avowed, and you are quite aſtray from the Doctrin of the Reformation: you have often granted me, that our Rule of faith is Scripture, not as this or that Congregation, Doctor, or Church, but as each Perſon of ſound judgment vnderſtands it; and now you tell me you hate and deteſt that Rule, becauſe that out of it, there follow ſtrange and blaſphemous Tenets? you ſay, the ſenſe and interpretation of the primitive ages, Church and Fathers muſt be prefered before the inter-

pretation of any privat Perſon or Congregation ; and what think you of our whole Reformation, and particularly of our 39. Articles of the Church of England, which allow no other Rule of faith but *Scripture as each perſon of ſound judgment underſtands it?* what ſay you of Luther, Calvin, Beza, and the reſt of our firſt Reformers, who preferred their own privat ſenſe and interpretation of Scripture, before that of the whole Church? what ſay you to the Preſbyterians, who preferr their own ſenſe and interpretation of the Bible, before that of the Church of England? what ſay you of all the Congregations of the Reformed Church, each one of which, holds its ſenſe and Doctrin of Scripture, different from all the reſt? I grant, there ought to be a reſpect for the judgment and interpretation of the Text, given by the Primitive Church and Fathers; but if a Doctor, or man of ſound judgment, replenisht with Gods Spirit, reades Scripture with an humble heart, and pure intention, and judges by it, that Bygamy is

lawfull ; that there is no Myſtery of three Perſons in one Divin Nature ; that Chriſt deſpaired on the Croſs, &c. tho theſe Doctrins be quite againſt the judgment of Fathers, Church, and Councils, he may believe them, and be ſtill a true Reformed Child, becauſe he follows our Rule of faith ; and if he muſt deny theſe Articles, becauſe others decry them; then he muſt go againſt his own judgement and conſcience, for to conform himſelf to them, and his Rule of faith muſt not be ſcripture as each man of ſound judgment vnderſtands it; but as the primitive Ages, Church, and Councils vnderſtand it ; and this is Popery.

Iſmael. Prethy friend Iſaac, let's give ouer : all that your diſcourſe drives at, by what I can perceive, is either to beate me from the Reformation by shewing me the abſurdity of its Rule of faith ; or oblige me to believe ſcandalous and blaſphemous Tenets as neceſſary ſequeles out of that Rule : I am à Child of the Reformation, and never will be otherwiſe.

Isaac. The Lord, who is the Searcher of hearts, knows, you misconster my intentions: how can you say I intēd to beate you from the Reformation; do not I insist and persuade you to stick fast to its Rule of faith, and acknowledge no other but Scripture, as you vnderstand it? how can you say, I oblige you to believe fals and scandalous Tenets? to the contrary, I advise you not to believe them, if you judge by scripture they are fals and scandalous: what my discourse drives at is, that you should not censure, blame, or call any Doctrin blasphemous, scandalous, fals, or heretical (Popery excepted) for, tho you judge by Scripture it is not true; an other will judge it to be the true sense and Doctrin of the Text, and if he does, he may with a safe conscience believe it, and ought not to be blamed by you or any other for believing it; if you do not like that Doctrin, do not believe it; but let the other believe as he judges by Scripture he may, and let every tub stand on its own bottom.

Ismael. Once more I beseech you

give ouer; I will not discourse any more with you.

Isaac. Nay Deare Ismael, I see you are troubled, and I will not leaue you in that perplexitie: be pleased to listen to three points I will propose vnto you, and you'l not miss to find satisfaction in either of them.

Ismael. Let's heare them.

Isaac. Will you believe Scripture, as it is interpreted, and in that sense which the Church, Councils, and Fathers propound vnto you?

Ismael. I will not be obliged to that; for I may judge by Scripture that sense and interpretation of it, to be fals and erroneous; and I will not be obliged to believe any thing against my judgment and conscience; that is Popery.

Isaac. That's well, in so much you follow the footsteps of Luther, Calvin, and our other fist Reformers, who would not believe what the Church believed in their tyme, nor regarded not, what the Papists alleadged out of the Councils and Fathers against them; because they

Held

held themſelves obliged to believe Scripture as they vnderſtood it, and not as it was vndeſtood by others: Will you then believe Scripture in that ſenſe and interpretation which yourſelf judges to be true, tho the Church, Councils, and all other Congregations, judge it to be fals and erroneous; and give the like libertie to all others?

Iſmael. That's dangerous; for it would follow, that any man might believe without check or blame, the greateſt blaſphemies imaginable, if he judges them to be the ſenſe of the Text.

Iſaac. Why then, ſince that the firſt does not pleaſe you, for feare of conſtraining your judgment Papiſt-like; and the ſecond diſpleaſes you, for the ſcope it gives for to believe any thing, or nothing; your beſt way will be to lay Scripture aſyde, wheras Chriſt has forgot, or neglected to appoint vs ſom aſſured means for to know, what ſenſe of it he would have vs believe.

Iſmael. And what Religion ſhall

J profeſs, if J lay Scripture aſyde?

Iſaac. The ſame which now you have by Scripture; that's to ſay, whatever you judge to be the true Worship of God: be ſure to profeſs a reverence for Scripture, and ſeem to believe its the Word of God; leaſt you may ſcandalize weake Brethren; pretend allwaies that your ſentiments are grounded vpon the Text; but betwixt you and God, believe whatever you think to be true, worship God, as you judge he is to be worshipt, and that's the way to liue in peace: do you think but that thoſe Noble Spirits, which they call the *Wits* of England, have a good Religion? in publick they ſpeake reverently of the Bible, but we know what they have, and do declare in their privat diſcourſes, that its but a *Romance* or meer fiction: Do you think but that there was a Religion in England before it ſaw *Gregori's* Emiſſaries, *Auſtin* and his Monks? what need therefore of a Bible for to have Religion? Were not the *Swinfeldians* a religious Congregation and of the

Reformation to, yet they cared not for Scripture, but grounded their belief vpon Gods inſpiration and inward ſpeech to the heart?

Iſmael. If I were not well acquainted with you, and had not very convincing proofes, and ſignal teſtimonies of your pietie, ſolid Religioſity, and Chriſtianity, I would judge you by this laſt peece of your diſcourſe, to be an impious Atheiſt or Pagan: and J wonder that ſo good a Chriſtian, as I know you to be, ſhould ſpeake ſo irreverently of the Bible, and ſo much in commendation of Paganiſm as you do: There was indeed a Religion in England before they knew what Scripture was; but that Religion was *Paganiſm*, which Auſtin and his Companions happily banisht from our Land.

Iſaac. Happily? do you call an exchange of *Paganiſm* for *Popery* (introduced by Auſtin) a Happineſs? is it not generally believed in our Reformation, and moſt ſtrongly proved of late, by that incomparable Wit and Pen-man Doctor

Stillingfleet, that *Popery* has as much of *Idolatry*, as *Paganiſm*: our land therefore had in *Paganiſm*, as good a Religion, as it received by *Auſtin* in *Popery*: does not this our noble Champion, and moſt of the *Scribes* of the Church of England teach, that Popery is a *ſaving Religion*, that we may be ſaued in the Church of Rome? if Popery (not withſtanding it be Idolatrie, as they ſay) be a ſaving Religion; how can they deny but that Paganiſm is alſo a ſaving Religion? what need had our Forefathers therefore to abandon Paganiſm? why was it not left in the land?

Iſmael. Whatever may be ſaid of *Popery*, it cannot be denied, but that *Chriſtianity* is better than *Paganiſm:* the expulſion therefore of *Paganiſm* by Auſtin was a Happineſs, becauſe by it *Chriſtianity* was introduced, and eſtablisht in our Kingdom.

Iſaac. Alas Iſmael, if England had bin as well informed of the merit of Paganiſm, when firſt Chriſtianity was preached, it had never exchanged the one for the other.

Ismael. What, not Paganism, which adored a Multitude of Gods, for Christianity which adores but one? Not Paganism, which adored *Jupiter*, *Saturn*, *Venus*, &c. who were Deuils and Evil Spirits, or wicked Men, who caused themselves to be adored, for Christianity, which adores the onely true, immortal and eternal Deytie?

Isaac. You speake with the vulgar sort; and believe as you have bin instructed by your Ancestors: I confess, the Apostles, and Ancient Doctors of Christianity do teach, that the Gods of the Gentils were Deuils or Euil Spirits; I confess also, all the Christian World since the first preaching of the Ghospell, was so perswaded, grounded vpon Scripture, which in several places saies, *the Gods of the Gentils were Deuils*, grounded vpon the Doctrin of the Apostles, and their Successors the Fathers of the Church, and the World being perswaded by the Apostles, by the Doctors, Fathers, and Preachers of Christianity, that the Gods which the Pagans adored

were but Deuils, which by ſorceries, and marvelous works deceiued mankind, and made themſelves to be adored as Gods, all men were aſhamed to adore but Deuils, forſooke Paganiſm, and embraced Chriſtianity. And all was but a meer Policy of Popery, to caſt ſo much dirt and calumnie vpon Paganiſm, and make its Gods but Deuils, for to introduce and eſtablish Chriſtianity; Dr. Stillingfleet in his *Charge of Idolatry againſt the Church of Rome*, Pag. 40. and 41. ſaies plainly, that *the Pagans are charged with more than they were guilty of*; page 7. ſaies that *Iupiter* adored by the Pagans, *was ſo farr from being an Arch-Devil, in the opinion of S. Paul, that he was the true God, bleſſed for ever more*: that the Pagans adored but one ſuprem and Omnipotent God, which they called Jupiter, and which they did believe to be neither a Devil, nor a Man, but a true, and the firſt and chiefeſt of the Gods; and that the reſt of the Gods, which they adored, they looked vpon them, as vpon *Inferior Deyties*, and gave them no

other adoration, but such as the Papists give to their Saints.

If therefore the Pagans adored the tru God under the name of Jupiter; and the other Gods but as inferior Deyties, as the Papists do their Saints; was it not injustly don by the Ancient Fathers and Teachers of Christianity, to have imposed vpon the World, and made vs believe the Pagans adored but Devils and Evil Spirits? have not the Pagans Ryght and justice on their syde, for to pleade before our wyse and religious Parliament, that Paganism may be restored, or at least tolerated, and *Iupiter*, with the rest of the Gods, may be adored, as formerly they were; first becaus Paganism is no more Idolatry than Popery, as Dr Stillinfleet, Mr Burnet and other Reformed Writers prove convincingly; secondly, becaus that Paganism having bin banisht out of our Land vpon the fals information of our first Teachers, that it was an Adoration of Devils, or Evil Spirits, and wicked debaucht Men, who by counterfeited wonders, and

cheate; gained the Peoples adoration; since that Dr Stillingfleet, Mr. Burnet, and other Reformed Writers will make it out, that the Pagans adored no Devils, but *One, tru Omnipotent, suprem God, blessed evermore,* which they called *Iupiter*, and the rest of the Gods as inferior Deities, as Papists do their Saints; and will prove that the Pagans were charged by the first DDrs of Christianity, and by all our Ancestors, with more than they were guilty of; why should not Paganism be restored again to the Land, and heard to speake for itselfe, and Dr Stillingfleet and his zealous companions be lycenc't to pleade for them, and for holy *Iupiter*, so fouly misrepresented by Antiquity, as to be believed an Arch-Devil, whom Dr. Stillingfleet will prove to have bin, *a tru God blessed for ever more.*

Ismael. The more J discourse with you, the more J am perplexed in mind; J bid you a Dieu, and do confess J carry with me from your discourse, a dislike of what I have bin hitherto, an vnsettlement in my per-

ſvaſion; and a compaſſion of the poore Pagans, ſo vniuſtly baniſht from our Nation, if what Dr Stillingfleet ſaies, be true: he is a learned, religious, and diligent ſearcher into Scripture; the Ancient DDrs and Fathers of the Church reading Scripture, judged and taught, that *Iupiter* was a Devil, as well as the reſt of the Gods which the Gentils adored; Dr Stillingfleet and other Reformed DDrs reading Scripture judge he was no Devil, but *the tru God, bleſſed for ever more*; any Child of the Reformation may believe either of both, and put Jupiter in our Litanies, as well as Jeſus Chriſt, and offer Sacrifice to him as formerly our Anceſtors did; for whatever any man of ſound judment judges to be the Doctrin of Scripture, may be ſafely believed, and is the Doctrin of the Reformation: as for my part, I ſee our Wyſe Parliament ſits now vpon a new ſettlement of Gouvernment and Religion, and I will not reſolve vpon any Religion, vntill I ſee what it concludes. If Dr Stillinfleet be ſo zealous, as to put in a good

Word for Paganiſm, before that Religious Aſſembly, he may find Abettors, and as the Parliament cherishes Dr Oates for the extirpation of Popery, ſo it may cherish Dr Stillingfleet for the introduction of Paganiſm, and the erecting of Temples and Altars for *holy Iupiter, his tru and evermore bleſſed God*; and if he be ſucceſsfull in this vndertaxing, as for exchanging Preſbytery for Proteſtancy, he was promoted to the Deanry of S. Pole, ſo by changing Chriſtianity for Paganiſm, he may expect to be his Holy *Iupiter's heigh Prieſt*, in London *Capitol*, and reign with him everlaſtingly in the other life, in caſe he believes there is an other.

FINIS.

Est inter Ianaim quiddam Sore-rumq; Visely